HISTORY OF
INDIAN LITERATURE

BY

M. WINTERNITZ

VOL III, PART I
(CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE)
TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN WITH ADDITIONS

BY

SUBHADRA JHĀ

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS
DELHI :: PATNA :: VARANASI
1922

Publishers :
SUNDARLAL JAIN
MOTILAL BANARSIDASS
Bungalow Road, Jawaharnagar
Delhi-6

Printers:
SHANTILAL JAIN
SHRI JAINENDRA PRESS
Bungalow Road, Jawaharnagar,
Delhi-6.

Books available at:—

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHARNAGAR, DELHI
MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, NEPALI KHAPRA, VARANASI
MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, BANKIPORE, PATNA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE

The first two volumes of the famous *Geschichte der indischen Litteratur* of the Late Dr. M. Winternitz were translated into English during the life-time of the author, and these two volumes, both in German and English, had been well received by orientalists throughout the world.

Even after a lapse of decades, when nothing of vol. III appeared in English from the ten of brilliant scholars, I took upon myself the task of studying in German itself the said volume, and undertook to translate it into English for my own use. But Shri Sundarlal, the enterprising proprietor of the firm Messrs Motilal Banarsidass, insisted that this translation should be got printed and published. I could not help but accede to his demand. I have for some years been collecting materials for writing an exhaustive and up-to-date history of Sanskrit Literature and here I have utilized some of the materials so collected by putting them within parentheses. I have provided original Sanskrit text in most of the cases to facilitate better appreciation.

I am grateful to several recent writers on this subject whose essays and books I have unsparingly used and have acknowledged in the body of the work.

Since the book is a work of reference, my friend Shri D. Satyanārāyaṇa has taken great pains in preparing an index that is more detailed than that in the original German to help the readers in its easy utilization.

I am fully aware of my poor knowledge of German and no claim is made that the present volume is so good as the two preceding ones, that were translated by an eminent German scholar Mrs. S. Ketkar. So my effort, in the terms of Kālidāsa, is like that of a dwarf raising up his arms in the fond hope of getting something that is beyond his reach and I, therefore, crave indulgence of the readers.

SUBHADRA JHĀ

FOREWORD

When 23 years ago I undertook to write a "history of the Indian literature" and had begun to work on its preliminaries, I hoped to be able to complete the work in one volume in about three to four years. But the more I dived deep into the subject, the mass of available materials heaped up the more and this increased the difficulties of shifting them. And thus the work, that was planned to cover a single volume, has now become one of three volumes, and parts of this book appeared at considerable intervals : 1904, 1908, 1913, 1920 and here is the last volume at the end. Now after the work is concluded, nobody can be aware of its shortcomings and imperfections more than its author himself. But in case I had wished to let it go into the world, these faults were mended, I would have to wait still for not less than 20 years. In particular I feel and have always felt the obvious deficiency that I have prepared a history of the Indian literature in a very limited measure. But the hard fact remains that we do not possess any trustworthy information about the oldest and most important works of Indian literature, and whatever we can say with regard to the antiquity and origin of the earliest religious and secular poetry as well as about the beginning of the scientific literature is nothing but hypothetical, and naturally many readers will be disappointed to find in *my history of literature* so few definite statements on chronological topics. In fact, I have been accused by a critic of having used expressions like "probably", "perhaps", "apparently", etc. at too many places. In case everything in the history of Indian literature had been fully clear it would have been easy to create an impression with discussions supported by more or less definite figures with regard to dates. But I believe that even a layman derives more benefit when he comes to know about the meagreness of chronological data in Indian literature than when one leads him into the hamlet of Potemkin. And for the beginners, who may choose to undertake research in Indology—they will need consulting this book the most, since it is of

great importance [at this stage of study] to be able to distinguish accurately between definite and indefinite statements in order to arrive at the points at which further researches hāve to be carried. For this very reason, I have stated in the footnotes the views that I do not participate in.

Since in respect of the history of literature I was obliged to keep myself within the limits of possibility, I have most vigorously exerted my efforts to provide the reader with most unambiguous representations of every type of literature and literary works and to introduce him assuredly of an insight into the spiritual creations of India. In order to check the work from becoming still more voluminous I had to keep myself within the limits of literature, though at times it is equally difficult to separate the history of religious literature from religion and to associate the history of culture with the history of literature. Likewise the history of scientific literature, treated in the last section, can hardly become a history of the sciences.

It is natural that during the period of several years that have gone by after the publication of the first part of this work our knowledge has advanced further. So I have tried to make the work up-to-date with the addenda and corrigenda given at the end of this book.* Since a greater part of the third volume was already printed by the end of 1920 it has become necessary to add even to this part the addenda and corrigenda, especially when for the first time quite a large number of works, so particularly the last volumes of the "Harvard Oriental Series", and the "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics" and the "Indian Antiquary" for the years 1914-1922 became available to me at the last moment of completion of my work.

One of my most pleasant duty is to thank all those with whose assistance it has been possible for the work to reach the stage of at least some form of completion. His Highness the Raja of Travancore and Pandit T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī Trivendrum, the fortunate discoverer and the talented editor of the dramas of Bhāsa, to whom we owe the

* The portion of the addenda and corrigenda relevant to volume III has been, in appropriate places, included in the main work itself and the foot notes.

first edition of a series of hitherto unknown and new editions of important known texts, have laid me under special obligations by presenting all the volumes of the Trivendrum Sanskrit Series that appeared till 1919. Professor Charles Rockwell Lanmann, the highly gifted editor of the splendid "Harvard Oriental Series" had the favour of sending me its volumes that have appeared during the period of the war, deserves my most cordial thanks. To Professors Johannes Hertel, Eugen Hultzsch, Hermann Jacobi, Julius Jolly and Theodor Zachariae I am grateful for several suggestions, supplements and improvements. Mr. Privatdozent, Dr. Otto Stein, has helped me in the work of proof-correction and in preparation of the index for the present volume, and I thank him for this.

Lastly, I thank also Mr. Johannes Ziegler, the Publisher and Bookseller (Messrs C. F. Amelangs Verlag), who in spite of the times being so hard for book trade, has taken scientific rather than business-like interest and has consented to extend the work into three volumes.

In the foreword to the second-half of the second volume I have mentioned the names of the researchers who have passed away in recent years : H. Kern († 1917), E. Windisch († 1918), P. Deussen († 1919), H. Oldenberg († 1920) and L. Von Schroeder († 1920), whose works have been mentioned so often in this book. This list was unfortunately even then incomplete and has since then become larger. Through the departure of Auguste Barth († 1916), Mabel K. H. Bode († 1922), Julius Eggeling († 1918), John Faithful Fleet († 1917), A. F. Rudolf Hoernle († 1918), Colonel G. A. Jacob († 1918), Joh. Kirste († 1920), Ernst Kuhn († 1920), Karl Eugen Neumann († 1915), Vincent A. Smith († 1920), George Thibaut († 1914) and Satis Chandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa († 1920) the band of Indologists has become thinner. A glance at the Index will demonstrate the extent to which the present work owes to them.

With melancholy I thank the always helpful friend Śāstraviśārada Jainācārya Vijayadharmasūri, who did me the favour of procuring

for my work many rare and hardly available Indian publications. In his last letter of July 21 from Śivapurī, Gwalior State, where he was spending the rainy season, he had written that he was ailing but was feeling better and hoped to be well soon. He was pleased at my visit I had paid to him last autumn. I too was happy on my arrival in India to call at his place and I thank him for his kindness. Now when I am writing this foreword, I get the sad news that the venerable Jaina priest expired on September 9 of this year. The promotion of European learned work had always been dear to his heart. May the collaboration of the Indian and European scholars continue in the manner and extent he had wanted ! This has certainly already reached the cross-word of knowledge of India.

Prague,
October 1922

M. Winternitz

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

[USED IN THIS VOLUME]

ABA=Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philol.-histor. Klasse.

ABayA=Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Phil. Klasse.

AGGW=Abhandlungen der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-histor. Klasse.

AKM=Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, herausg. von der Deutschen Morganländischen Gesellschaft.

ĀnSS=Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series (Poona).

AR=Archiv für Religionsgeschichte.

ASGW=Abhandlungen der philol.-histor. Klasse der Köngl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.

Aufrecht, Bod. Cat=Th. Aufrecht, Catalogus Codicum MSS. Sanscriticorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae, Oxonii 1859—64.

Aufrecht CC=Th. Aufrecht, Catalogus Catalogarum. Leipzig 1891; II, 1896; III, 1903.

Aufrecht, Leipzig=Katalog der Sanskrit-Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek zu Leipzig 1901.

BEFEO=Bulletin de l'ecole française d'Extrême Orient.

Benfey=Pantschatantra aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt mit Einleitung u. Anm. by Th. Benfey, Leipzig 1859.

BenSS=Benares Sanskrit Series.

Bezz. Beitr.=Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen herausg. von A. Bezzenberger.

Bhandarkar, Report 1882/83=R. G. Bhandarkar, Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bombay Presidency during the year 1882-83, Bombay 1884.

Bhandarkar, Report 1883/84=R. G. Bhandarkar, Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bombay Presidency during the year 1883/84, Bombay 1887.

Bhandarkar, Report 1884/87=R. G. Bhandarkar, Report etc. during the years 1884-85, 1885-86 and 1886-87, Bombay 1894.

Bhandarkar, Report 1887/91=R.G. Bhandarkar, Report etc. during the years 1887-88, ...1890-91, Bombay 1897.

S. R. Bhandarkar, Report II=Shridhar R. Bhandarkar, Report of a Second Tour in Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts made in Rajputana and Central India in 1904-5 and 1905-6. Bombay 1907.

Bhandarkar Comm. Vol.=Commemoration Essays presented to Sir Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, Poona 1917.

Bibl. Ind.=Bibliotheca Indica.

BSGW=Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königl. Sächsischen Gessellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philol.—histor. Klasse.

BSOS=Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution.

BSS=Bombay Sanskrit Series.

Bühler, Hemacandra=G. Bühler, Über das Leben des Jaina-Mönches Hemacandra : Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie 1889.

Bühler, Report=G. Bühler, Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts made in Kaśmir, Rajputana, and Central India. Extra Number of the JBRAS 1887.

Burnell, Tanjore=A.C. Burnell, A classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS in the Palace at Tanjore, London 1880.

ChSS=Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series (Benares)

CUIS=Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, ed. by A.V.W. Jackson.

Deussen, AGPh=P. Deussen, Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie 1, 1—3. Leipzig 1894 (2. Aufl. 1906)—1908.

DLZ=Deutsche Literaturzeitung.

Duff=C. Mabel Duff. The Chronology of India, Westminster 1899.

Ep. Ind.=Epigraphia Indica

ERE=Encyclopaedia of Religions and Ethics, edited by James Hastings.

Festschrift Kuhn=Aufsätze zur Kultur-und Sprachgeschichte vornehmlich des Orients Ernst Kuhn...gewidmet... München 1916.

Festschrift Windisch=Festschrift Ernst Windisch zum 70. Geburtstag ...dargebracht...Leipzig 1914.

GGA=Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen.

Grundriss=Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde.

GSAI=Giornale della Società America Asiatica Italiana.

Haeberlin=Kāvyasaṁgraha by J. Haeberlin, Calcutta 1847.

Harprasād, Report I, II=Haraprasād Śāstrī, Report on the Search of Sanskrit MSS (1895-1900). Calcutta 1901 and (1901-02 to 1905-06) Calcutta 1905.

HOS=Harvard Oriental Series, ed. by Ch. R. Lanman.

Ind. Ant.=Indian Antiquary.

Ind. Off. Cal.=Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office, London 1887 ff.

Ind. Stud.=Indische Studien, herausgegeben von A. Weber.

JA=Journal Asiatique.

JAOS=Journal of the American Oriental Society.

JASB=Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

JBRAS=Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

JPTS=Journal of the Pāli Text Society.

JRAS=Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

Kathavate, Report=A. V. Kathavate, Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bombay Presidency... 1891-92...1894-95. Bombay 1901.

Keith, HSL=A.B. Keith, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature.

Keith, SD=A. B. Keith, Sanskrit Drama.

Km.=Kāvyamālā (Bombay).

Krishnamacharya=M. Krishnamacharya, A History of the Classical Sanskrit Literature, Madras 1906.

Lévi=Sylvain Lévi, Le Théatre Indien, Paris 1890.

LZB=Literarisches Zentralblatt.

Mélanges Lévi=Mélanges d'Indianisme offerts par ses élèves á M. Sylvain Lévi...Paris 1911.

NGGW=Nachrichten von der Kgl. : Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Göttingen, Philog.-histor. Klasse.

NSP=Nirṇaya Sāgara Press (Bombay).

OC=Orientalistenkongresse (Verhandlungen, Transactions, Actes).

Oldenberg LAI= H. Oldenberg, Die Literatur des alten Indien, Stuttgart u. Berlin 1903.

OTF.=Oriental Translation Fund.

Peterson, Report 1882-83=P. Peterson, Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS in the Bombay Circle 1882-83 (JBRAS, vol. 16, Extra Number).

Peterson, Report II=P. Peterson. A Second Report of Operations in Search of Sanskrit MSS...1883-84. JBRAS, vol. 17, Extra Number).

Peterson, Report IV=P. Peterson, A Fourth Report... 1886-92. (JBRAS, vol. 18, Extra Number).

Peterson, Report V=P. Peterson. A Fifth Report...April 1892—March 1895, Bombay 1896.

Peterson 3. Reports=P. Peterson, Three Reports on a Search for Sanskrit MSS with an Index of Books (JBRAS Vol. 18, Extra Number.) 1887.

Peterson, Subh.=The Subhāṣitāvali of Vallabhadeva, ed. by P. Peterson (BSS 1886). Introduction.

Pischel, KG=R. Pischel, Die indische Literatur, in Kultur der Gegenwart I, 7, 1906.

PTS=Pali Text Society.

RHR=Reveue de l'histoire des Religions, Paris.

RSO=Rivista degli studi Orientali, Rom.

Rückert-Nachlese=Sammlung der zerstreuten Gedichte und Übersetzungen Friedrick Rückerts herausg. von L. Hirsberg, Weimar 1910-11.

SBA=Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften.

SBay A=Sitzungberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wiss., Philol.-histor. Kl.

SBE=Sacred Books of the East (Oxford).

Schroeder, ILC=L. von Schroeder, Indiens Literatur und Cultur, Leipzig 1887.

Schyler, Bibliography=M. Schuyler, Bibliography of the Sanskrit Drama, New York 1906.

SIFI=Studi Italiani di Filologia Indo-Iranica.

Smith, Early History=Vincent A Smith, The Early History of India. Third Edition, Oxford 1914.

SWA=Sitzungssberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Thomas=Kavīndravacanasamuccaya, A Sanskrit Anthology of Verses, ed. by F. W. Thomas, Bibl. Ind. 1912.

TSS=Trivendrum Sanskrit Series.

VizSS=Vizianagram Sanskrit Series (Benares).

Weber, HSS. Verz.=A. Weber, Verzeichnis der Sanskrit- und Prākrit-Handschriften der K. Bibliothek zu Berlin.

Weber, LG=A. Weber, Akademische Vorlesungen über indische Literaturgeschichte, 2. Auflage, Berlin 1876.

Wilson= H.H. Wilson, Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus (Works, vols. XI, XII).

W=Winternitz in places where he has referred to his own view S.

Winternitz-Keith. Bodl. Cat.=Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Vol. II begun by M. Winternitz, Continued and completed by A.B. Keith, Oxford 1905.

WZKM=Wiener Zeitschift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.

ZDMG=Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.

ZII=Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik herausgegeben von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

ZVV=Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde in Berlin.

SECTION IV

ORNATE POETRY

Characteristics of Ornate Poetry

By "ornate poetry" the people in the west render the Indian term "kāvya" which, though ordinarily meaning "poetry", in rhetorics has the special connotation—polished expression", the main characteristic whereof, as a poetic piece, is that it attaches more importance to the form than to the subject-matter. It was cultivated particularly, if not exclusively[1], in the courts of Indian princes and, consequently, is often styled "court poetry".

Originally, even the old heroic poetry, that later became so popular, as we learn from the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa, was courtly. The bards (sūtas), who were the carriers and propagators of this ballad lore, too, lived in the courts of the princes and sang to make their exploits known. They would accompany their patrons even to battlefields, so that on return they could sing of the exploits of the warriors. These court bards stood closer to the Kṣatriyas than to the learned Brāhmaṇas. Very often they worked as chariot-drivers of the warriors in these campaigns and participated in their ventures. It was, however, a time of unrest in which these heroic songs originated—an age of strifes and crude practices, when hunting, gambling, and competitive contests were favourite recreations of the princes. It was only during hours of rest, at banquet gatherings, victory celebrations, and on occasions of sacrificial performances that bards would recite their ballads[2]. Firstly as life in courts became more refined, in place of these bards there came in more learned artisans who were brought up in the schools of the Brāhmaṇas and competed in

1. Not only the princes, but all high dignitaries and rich people, as a rule, appear as patrons of poets, and literary "saloons" flourished not only in courts but also in Brāhmaṇical settlements and in big cities...Cf. F.W. Thomas, JRAS 1910, 972f.

*2. Cf. above I, 262 (tr. p. 315) and Hertel, Tantrākhyāyikā, I, pp. 10ff. Indians call the Mahābhārata too a "kāvya"; see above I, 267 (tr. p. 312).

scholarly contests with them. These poets described strifes and battles too merely on the basis of heresays in a mechanical manner. They would attach greater importance to the elegance of form and to erudition[1] than to the creative faculty or poetical talent. Writers of panegyrics who could sing in praise of their patrons in artistic verses were past masters in the poetic art. Apparently, panegyric constituted the original theme of this kind of poetry (for being sung publicly in courts). And this explains also the origin of the k ā v y a s t y l e, that is to say—the style of court poetry. The more the poet strained himself, the more he displayed his skill, the more difficult his work, and the prince felt flattered the more[2].

---

1. Even a poet of the eminence of Kālidāsa does not escape this; he too airs his knowledge of grammar occasionally in similes ; see Raghuvaṁśa 12, 58 and 15, 9.

[2. The other view about the origin and development of the "kāvya" style may be presented as follows: "The pessimism of the Buddhistic ideal gradually disappeared, having been replaced by more-accommodating views about the value of pleasure. Even the Buddhist author of the Nāgānanda has thought it fit to weave a love-theme into the lofty story of Jīmūtavāhana's self-sacrifice, and in his opening benedictory stanza he does not hesitate to represent the Buddha as being scolded for his hard-heartedness by the ladies of Māra's train. From Patañjali's references we find that from its very dawn love was recognised as one of the dominant themes of kāvya poetry. The Buddhist conception of the love god as Māra or Death makes way for the flower-arrowed god who is anticipated in the Atharvaveda and is established in the epics, but whose appearance, name and personality are revived and developed in the fullest measure in the kāvya.

"The dominant love-motif of the kāvya is explained by the social environment in which it grows and from which alone it can obtain recognition. It is, however, not court-life alone which inspires this literature. At the centre of it stands the nāgaraka, the polished man of the town, whose culture, tastes and habits so largely mould this literature that he may be taken to be as typical of it as the priest or the philosopher is of the literature of the Brāhmaṇas or the Upaniṣads.

"It is not impossible to offer a compromise between these two divergent views on the development of kāvya that is neither wholly heroic or courtish, nor completely erotic. Poetry developed in courts no doubt, but its background was laid in the society at the same time. Naturally, therefore, whilst the poet would like to sing in praise of his patrons, he would introduce anecdotes from the life of the common man for the development of his theme in a suitable manner. Poetry offers recreations. Neither the heroic kāvya nor the erotic alone could be always agreeable; of course in the opinion of the Indian rhetoricians the vīra or the śṛṅgāra could become the dominant sentiment of kāvya.

This blending of two different tastes in kāvya is reflected in the writings and legends of the very ancient period. Rājā Janaka, the ascetic king of Mithilā, is reported as maintaining a band of courtesans and the Buddha is described as pining in his anxiety for the welfare of the world, for peace, patience and enjoyment. (S. K. De, Sans. Lit. p. 18 ff.)].

Earliest evidence traces of "court poetry" is found in the Rāmāyaṇa. Indians themselves call Vālmīki "the first poet (ādikavi)" and the Rāmāyaṇa "the first poem (ādikāvya)", and several sections of this epic, in fact, already exhibit in full characteristics of the kāvya style[1]. The court epic of the classical age of Sanskrit poetry presents this style in full blossom; besides, it has made inroads into lyrical compositions, gnomic poetry, drama, and narrative literature, and has not spared even the religious poetry of the Buddhists and the Jainas.

The essential peculiarities of the kāvya style are :—accumulation of similes and fascination for long, winding descriptions—especially for certain stereotyped representations (e.g., of the seasons, the sun-rise, the moonlit night, etc.). Descriptions of this sort not infrequently occupy so much space that the subject of the poem disappears into the back-ground so much so that the contents of many cantos of an epic or of books of a romance at a stretch become capable of two distinct interpretations. Not to speak of employing artificial internally rhyming and artistically-constituted metres, the use of rare words and long compounds of words with more than one meanings, strange, play of words, strenuous efforts made throughout to express nothing in a straight-forward way[2], with a desire to conceal as much as possible or to express an idea in a round-about way and

1. See above, I, 404f. (tr. p. 475). The possibility indeed is not always ruled out that here we have a case of later-day interpolation made in an old poem. Cf. above I,416 A, 417A, 424, 431 (tr. pp. 489,490,497,505).The places showing the kāvya style are more seldom in the Mahābhārata (ibid I, 308, 320, 393 (tr. pp. 364,376,461) and the Harivaṁśa (ibid, I,387A, tr. p.452). [Keith, Sans. Lit. p. 43—Vālmīki and those who improved upon him, probably in the period 400-200 B.C. are clearly the legitimate ancestors of the court epic. Although some of its parts showing elegances of style, which mark the poem, are later additions, there is no ground whatever to admit that these additions fall later than the second century B.C., and they may be even earlier in date (ibid, p. 42). J a c o b i, Rāmāyaṇa, pp. 119ff. The Rāmāyaṇa also shows the development of the śloka metre almost in its classical state; cf. SIFI. VII, ii, 38ff. Love charms of the Atharvaveda attest the beginning of erotic poetry (IS. V, 218ff. K e i t h, ibid)].

[2. This point has been further elaborated by inclusion of poetic conventions in this list by S. K. D e, Sans. Lit., p. 28 ff. There he refers to the following in support of the view : Kāvyādarśa I, 14-19 ; Sāhityadarpaṇa VI, 315-25 ; Kāvyamīmāṁsā XIV ; Kāvyakalpalatā I, 5 ; Sāhityadarpaṇa VII, 23-24 etc. ; and M. B l o o m f i e l d Festschrift, Ernst. W i n d i s c h, Leipzig 1914, pp. 349-61 ; JAOS XXXVI, 1917, p. 54-89 ; XL 1920, p. 1-12 ; XLIV 1924, 202-42); W. Norman B r o w n, JAOS XLVII, 1927 pp. 3-24 ; etc. Here he has further successfully justified the standpoint of the Indian poets (ibid, pp. 32 ff.)].

that too in the form of a riddle[1]. The climax of artistry is attained when a poet succeeds in making one and the same sentence or verse express two different ideas at one and the same time! This phase of Indian poetry cannot be better described than through these stanzas of Fr. T. Vischer's[2] ridiculing symbolico-mystic poetry :

" That Poetry above is most valuable
As has its meaning quite—obscure!"
" That which a reader understands without much strain
Comparable to the ordinary home-made bread surely is,
The finest pastry of his bakery is out
What the poet projects in a riddle."
" Poetry radiates its magic light most brilliantly—
When a reader baffled breaks his head in vain".

"Kāvya" poetry, is not only artificial, it is also learned. The real poet must have studied most of the different sciences. Needs must he master lexicons for the purpose of finding out the rarest possible words and such words as have diverse meanings, with a view to being able to form long compounds analysable in different ways and capable of connoting different meanings. He must learn grammar so that he may not err in verbal structures. He must be adept in treatises on war-craft and politics for introducing in his poem descriptions of wars and political trickeries in appropriate contexts. He must be thoroughly familiar with the science of erotics (kāmaśāstra) to be able to describe love-scenes and sentiments of loving couples in accordance with "prescribed" regulations. Above this he must have made his own the text-books on prosody and poetics in order to introduce into his poem possibly the most difficult metres and a rich variety of the figures of speech (alaṁkāras, "embellishments"). It is significant to note that Indians designate what in Europe is called poetics as "The Science of Embellishment (Alaṁkāraśāstra)".

1. The rhetorician Ānandavardhana says : *prasiddham astyeva vidagdhavidvatpariṣatsu yad abhimataṁ vastu vyaṅgyatvena prakāśyate na sākṣād-vācyatvena,* "In the refined society of the cultured people it is a settled practice that one does not speak out what lies in one's inmost heart in a straight-forward manner, rather that one should convey it in the form of a suggestion, (Dhvanyāloka IV, 5, translated into German by H. J a c o b i, ZDMG 57, 335).

2. In his parody "Faust, der Tragoedie, dritter Teil (6th ed.. Tübingen 1907, 165 ff.).

In order to achieve a true representation of Indian poetry it is necessary to study Indian poetics along with dramaturgy and prosody as closely associated disciplines. Although such a study properly would have constituted a section on scientific literature, even here it will be not out place, since this science itself is originally based on certain master-works that belonged to poetry on the one hand and to the earlier traditions of the Alaṁkāraśāstra on the other. Moreover, these treatises on poetics always illustrate their rules with examples either composed by the authors of the manuals themselves or cited from (in their opinion) the best poets, or from anthologies, (in which are preserved many pieces of genuine poetry, that otherwise would have been lost).

Indian Poetics, Dramaturgy and Prosody

P o e t i c s (alaṁkāraśāstra) has been cultivated in India from a very early date as a science. However, we do not possess the earliest work. As is mostly the case with Indian scientific literature, we know about the existence of earlier works only from quotations from them in later manuals. As soon as a more recent scientific work became famous or proved practical, the earlier works, in general, were referred to with respect and there their story ended. Hence they have not come down to us. Even so is the case with the alaṁkāraśāstra too.

Usually it is assumed that poetics is preserved in its oldest form in the B h ā r a t ī y a-N ā ṭ y a ś ā s t r a[2], a text

1. Cf. P. R e g n a u d, La Rhétorique Sanskrite, Paris 1884; R. P i s c h e l, GGA 1885, p. 757 ff; G.A. J a c o b, JRAS 1897, 281ff; 1898, 289 ff.; Joh. N o b e l, Beitrage zur älteren Geschichte der Alaṁkāraśāstra; Diss., Berlin 1911, and ZDMG 66, 1912, 283 ff.; 67, 1913, 1 ff.; 73, 1919, 189 ff.; P.V. K a n e, Outlines of the History of Alaṁkāra Literature. Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 124 ff.; H. O l d e n b e r g, LAI 203 ff.; H a r i C h a n d, Kālidāsa et l'art poétique de l'Inde, Paris 1917. The best representation of Indian poetics and theory of poetry is given by H. J a c o b i in "Uber Begriff und Wesen der poetischen Figuren in der indischen Poetik", NGGW 1908, and in "Die Poetik und Ästhetik der Inder" in the Internat. Wochenschrift, 29 Oct. 1910. [Contributions to the Alaṁkāraśāstra literature have been made also by F.W. T h o m a s and V.V. S o v a n i in Bhandarkar Com. Vol. 375ff., 387ff.].

2. W. H e y m a n n was the first scholar to throw light on the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra on the basis of south Indian manuscripts in NGGW 1874, 86ff. P. R e g n a u d published a number of chapters: Adhyāya 6-74 in the La Rhétorique Sanskrite, Paris 1884, adhy. 15-17 in the Annales du Musée Guimet, part I and part II. The adhy. 20-22 and 34 (=18—20 and 34 of the Km. ed.) are published by F.E. H a l l in the Annexture to his edition ot Daśarūpa. The adhy. 28 (on music) has been published by J. G r o s s e t, Contribution à l'étude de la musique hindoue, Paris 1888.

book on dramaturgy by Muni Bharata[1]. Critics appear first to have felt the necessity of writing manuals for mimes for the purpose of giving the players necessary guidance in dramatic performances and in representations of dramatic poetry. From brief rules or a primer for actors (naṭasūtra)[2] might have developed more voluminous text books on dramaturgy (nāṭyaśāstra), in which not only mimicry, dance, music and song, but also dramatic songs would be dealt with. Then from it must have, first of all, issued individual manuals on the art of poetry or poetics. In this way we can at least explain the supposition that the theory on the art of poetry, in its oldest form, is found in the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra. But our misfortune is that this Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra has not come down to us in its original form and is available in fragments only, wherein mostly half the text is found in a very bad condition.

The Nāṭyaśāstra, as inherited by us, has an encyclopaedic character and gives the impression as if it is collected from several different texts. It is composed in greater part in the

A critical edition of the adhy. 1—14 by J. Grosset appeared in Paris 1898. The complete work is published in the Km. 42, 1894. F. Cimmin's L'uso delle didascalie nel dramma Indiano, Napoli 1912 was known to W. only through the review of Pavolini (GSAI 25, 1937, 321 f.). The discovery of a complete manuscript has been announced by S. Lévi in Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres 1899, p. 85. Cf. also H. H. Dhruva in Asiat. Quart. Review III, 2, 1896, 349 ff. and Haraprasād Śāstri in JASB 5, 1909, 351 ff.

1. At the end of the book occurs the word "Nandibharata-*saṅgītapustakam*", that is capable of two interpretations : it may suggest that Nandibharata was its author, or it may mean that the copy of the manuscript belonged to a person of that name. The latter one appears more cogent on account of the occurrence of *samāptaścāyam*, both in the masculine, before it, since *ayam* cannot be used in relation to *pustakam*. The name Nandibharata appears also as the author of a work on music (Aufrecht, CC I, 276), and Nandin as author of a work on mimic (Abhinayadarpaṇa). However, there, is also one Abhinayadarpaṇa of Nandikeśvara (Aufrecht CC III, s.v.). This book has been translated into English by Anand Coomaraswamy and G. K. Duggira (Cambridge, Mass. 1917), see L. D. Barnett, JRAS 1917, 627f. Bharata means also "actor." R. Pischel, KG. 183 has translated the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra, therefore, as "Lehrbuch der Schauspielkunst für Schauspieler—Manual of Histrionic Art for Actors" and adds "Or, as the Indian interpret, of Bharata, who is considered to be the director of the theatre of gods and is claimed to be the originator of the drama". Firstly, it is doubtful if the word "Bharata" means "actor" and therefore, cannot be associated with the mythical author of Nāṭyaśāstra, or if Bharata, as the name of the author of the famous manual on the historionic art could later get the meaning "actor". In the Viṣṇupurāṇa III, 6, Muni Bharata is named as the originator of the Gandharvaveda, that is to say, of Music.

2. This was known to Pāṇini 4, 3, 110.

epical ślokas, but there occur also verses in other metres (notably in Āryā) and small stray big pieces in prose. The work comprises of 38 sections (adhyāyas or "lessons").

The first and the last three sections relate to the origin of the art of drama and are wholly mythical. The gods, under the leadership of Indra, expressed their desire for some sort of entertainment that should be enjoyable by the eye and delightful to the ear at the same time, to the creator Brahman, the grand'Father, who was pleased to create, as a fifth Veda—the Nāṭyaveda. It was proposed that the drama should be staged for the first time on the occasion of the flag ceremony (*dhvaja-mahaḥ*) to celebrate the defeat of the demons by the gods in honour of Indra and in his palace. Bharata and his disciples made arrangements for its staging. They selected as its plot the victory of the gods over the demons. The gods, when they saw it, were very much pleased, and they distributed rewards to the actors. The demons, who too were there, became very much angry and they threw all sorts of obstacles, catastrophically paralysing the tongue, the mind and the skill of the actors with demoniac magic. Indra became very angry and severely chastised the demons. The actors were again busy with preparation for the stage and again the aggrieved demons presented obstacles in their way. Adequate security measures were taken by the gods; then they requested the creator Brahman to find out if the matter could be settled by mutual agreement. Accordingly Brahman approached the demons and inquired as to what the trouble was with them. The chief of the demons replied that both the gods and the demons had in the creator Brahman their common grand'Father and as such the grand'Father ought not to have done this. Brahman appeased them by explaining that the Nāṭyaveda he had created would depict both the noble as well as the ignoble activities of the gods as of the demons, and concluded by saying : "This art has been created by me as reflecting of life and activity of the world, with all the different sentiments amidst changing situations and in their entirety as a centre, where the activities of

the people (the highest, middle and lowest) converge— so as to have the same as a medium of education and as a force, giving impetus to bravery and as a source of entertainment, pleasure, etc. There is no learning, no craft, no science, no fine art, no religious exercise (yoga), no ascetic discipline, that is not witnessed in this Nāṭyaveda"[1]. In the last two sections is described how the drama that was first staged in the court of Indra in the presence of gods by the disciples of Bharata and Nārada came to the earth in consequence of a curse from the sages, (whom the actors had ridiculed rather vulgarly) to the effect that they would have to lead a despised life, maintained by their women and children. At this Indra and other gods expressed their fear to the sages that the art of drama might perish, to which the latter said that they had not meant so and that it would not be so. Thereupon, Bharata taught this science to the apsarases so that it might not die out. At the time king Nahuṣa was ruling over the earth. He was a great friend of Indra. The king of men requested the king of gods to depute the apsarases (actresses) to stage a drama in his palace on the earth. But the gods led by Bṛhaspati objected to the free association of the divine beings with the human's. Nevertheless, they advised Bharata to go to the earth and organise the drama there. The latter asked his children and disciples to go to the earth and wished them to be born there. They instantly obeyed and through them developed on earth the drama. To minimise the effect of the curse god Brahman blessed that it should never die.

This wholly mythological framing of the text-book, reminiscent of the purāṇas as it is, in any case, shows that the histrionic art was held in great esteem and played a significant part in the life of the people.

The individual chapters of the Nāṭyaśāstra, however, are not concerned with the drama alone as a form of literature, but rather with theatrical performance as a whole. They describe construction of the stage and its inauguration with observance of religious ceremonies (II, III) and the different types of physical

1. I, 78f, 82. (Grosset 110f., 115).

movements in dance and mimicry (IV,VIII-XIV,XXIV, XXV). For example, here is enjoined how the actor will express the setting-in of the various seasons: winter, summer etc., the feelings of pleasure, anger, jealousy, etc., explaining facts about the pūrvaraṅga—that is the religious prelude to the performance (V), the sentiments (rasa, VI), emotions (bhāvas, VII), prosody (chandaḥ XV) and the figures of speech (alaṁkāra, XVI), the different languages and dialects to be used in dramas and their allocation to different characters, the modulation of voice, etc. (XVII), the ten types of dramatic poetry (daśarūpa) and their distinctive characters (XVIII), the development of action in the drama (XIX), the different kinds of dramatic style of composition (XX), the costumes, the decoratives, colours of the dress and ornaments etc., distinguishing the different characters (gods, demi-gods, and the different castes, etc.) appearing on the stage (XXI), the many types of heroes, heroines and characters in the play (XXII-XXIV)[1], the allotment of rôles to and the training of actors (XXVI, XXXV), the time, place and occasion for a performance etc., etc., (XXVII) and for music and songs (XXVIII-XXXIV).

The arrangement is in no way systematic and makes us feel that probably we do not have here a work of single author, but a compilation of older and more recent texts, before us. The original work, presumably, was a sūtra-text, in the manner of the oldest scientific writings[2]. The memorial verses (kārikās), that relate to the histrionic art, had early already existed. It is, however, not possible to determine the time when the oldest texts, from which our work was compiled, were written. And, likewise, we have yet to establish the time when the redaction of the text-book, as we have it, took place[3]. The fact that it did

1. XXII, 94-138 and XXIII, 51 ff. The portion dealing with the lover and the beloved has been translated by R. Schmidt, Beiträge zur indischen Erotik, p. 250 ff. and 161 f., into German.

2. A poet of the 9th century comparing the dark waves of the Yamunā with the style of Bharata, points to a sūtra form (see Lévi 300).

3. When Regnaud (cf. Lévi 299 f., Oldenberg, LAI 205) gives "the first century of the Christian era" as the time of Bharata, his statement is as much unfounded as that of Pischel (GGA 1885, 763 f.) when he comes down to the 6th or 7th century A.D. P. R. Bhandarkar (Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 158 f.) rightly explains that it will be futile to attempt to determine the age of the author of the Nāṭyaśāstra, since it is a remodelled work. He believes with regard to the chapter on music especially that its age can never be earlier than the 4th century. Haraprasād Śāstrī (JASB

undergo such a final redaction is proved by its purāṇa-style construction and as a regular dialogue between the Muni (Bharata) and the ṛṣis. With regard to the time of its composition we can only say this that a work on dramaturgy ascribed to Bharata did indeed exist during the time of the poet Bhāsa[1]. Kālidāsa mentions not only the Nāṭyaśāstra, but knows also its law-giver Bharata[2]. Mātṛgupta, a contemporary of Kālidāsa, is believed to have written a metrical commentary on it[3].

The basic principle of rasas or "sentiments" in Indian poetics and aesthetics must have been developed for the first time in the Nāṭyaśāstra[4]. The word rasa primarily means "taste". Just as different spices leave behind different tastes, sweet or sour or bitter, even so does the emotion (bhāva) represented on the stage arouse in the mind of the audience apt sentiments. Bharat observes eight such rasas, namely: the sentiments excited through love (śṛṅgāra), humour (hāsya), pity (karuṇā) terror (raudra), heroism (vīra), fear (bhayānaka), aversion (bībhatsa)[5] and astonishment (adbhuta)[6]. From this theory of the rasas originates the remarkable system of Indian aesthetics as an inevitable offshoot from its psychological theory of emotions (bhāvas). When one reads, however, the strikingly apt and scientific, though elaborated classification of the plot (vastu,

6, 1910, 307) conjectures that the Nātyaśāstra belongs to the 2nd century A.D. Jacobi (Bhavisatta Kaha von Dhaṇavāla p. 84) "perhaps to the 3rd century". P.V. Kane (Ind. Ant. 46, 1917, 177 ff.) shows that Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra could not have been written later than the 3rd century A.D.

1. Sten Konow in Festschrift Kuhn, p. 111.

2. Mālavikāgnimitram, Act 1; Vikramorvaśīyam, Act III, where Bharata enters as a stage-director in the celestial palace of Indra and where too is mentioned the doctrine of eight rasas. Report about staging a drama in the heaven is found also in the Uttararāmacaritam of Bhavabhūti.

3. So according to a quotation in Nāṭyapradīpa of Sundaramiśra (1613 A.D.). Cf. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. III, p. 348. The kārikās of Kāvyaprakāśa (4, 7-11) are identical with Bharatiya-Nāṭyaśāstra VI, 18-22). Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra has been quoted at Kāvyaprakāśa, 4, 27 f. Poet Acala hails Bharata, as the author of the Nāṭyaśāstra in a pillar edict (8th or 9th century A.D.) in two verses; see Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. VII, App. Nr. 1042.

4. Cf. Max Lindenau, Beiträge zur altindischen Rasalehre, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Nāṭyaśāstra das Bharata Muni. Diss. Leipzig 1913. Rudra (Śṛṅgāratilaka 1, 5) expressly says that he generally uses the rasa-theory in poetry too which is usually confined to drama alone by Bharata and others.

5. W. has bībhatsā.

6. It points to fine dramatic taste amongst Indian rhetoricians that they exclude the sentiment of peace (śānta) from a performance permitting it exclusively in didactic poetry.

itivṛtta) of heroes (nāyakas) and heroines (nāyikās)[1] and of many another matter besides, it becomes clear unfortunately that we have before us a pretty fruitless science that is devoted more to classification and systematisation than to exploration of facts and formulation of rules. Much the same is the case with poetics too.

In the section on poetic embellishments (alaṁkāras) Bharata has not so much to say as the other text books on poetics have. In fact the number of figures of embellishments in his book falls far short of those of Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa, Daṇḍin etc.

The Agnipurāṇa, which deals with poetics in chapters 336—346, includes chapters 337—341 devoted to the drama exclusively, approaching the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra scheme even literally. Whilst, however, Bharata knows only ten types of drama, in the Agnipurāṇa there are enumerated its 27 varieties. Chapter 340 in particular treats of mimicry in detail. Here we are told, for example, that there are 13 different kinds of postures for the head, 7 different kinds of movements for the eye-brows, 36 ways of expressing sadness eyes, 58 love through eyes, 6 turns for the nose, 24 gestures for the hand, etc. Then, poetic embellishments themselves are divided into "embellishments of the sound" (śabdālaṅkāra) and "embellishments of the meaning" (arthālaṁkāra)—a division yet unknown to Bharata. The highly complicated figures of speech enumerated in the Agnipurāṇa show that this section on Indian poetics does not go to a very high antiquity[2].

The older school of poetics is represented by three rhetoricians : Bhāmaha, Daṇḍin and Vāmana.

That B h ā m a h a, the son of Rakrilagomin, is the oldest among native rhetoricians (those whose works have survived to date), stand to reason on weighty grounds[3], although we are

[1. W. nayakī.]

2. All that we can say about the antiquity of the Agnipurāṇa is that it is cited as an authority in the Sāhityadarpaṇa (see L é v i, op. cit. p. 16).

3. They have been stated by J a c o b i, ZDMG 64, 1910, 130ff., 751 ff., Joh. N o b e l, Beiträge zur altern Geschichte des Alaṁkāraśāstra, p. 78, f.; and passim (see also ZDMG 73, 1919, 190 ff.), K.P. T r i v e d ī, Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣana, Introd. p. XXVIII ff and Ind. Ant. 42, 1913, 258 ff., and R. N a r a s i m h a c h a r a, Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 90 ff., 42, 1913. 205 and have not been weakened by K.B. P a t h a k, Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 232 ff. T. N a r a s i m h i e n g a r and P.V. K a n e, JRAS 1905, 535 ff. and 1908, 543 f. consider Bhāmaha younger than Daṇḍin. G a ṇ a p a t i Ś ā s t r ī (Bhāsa's Svapnavāsavadattam, Intro. p. XXV ff.) adduces very weak arguments in support of his view that Bhāmaha lived in the first century A.D,

position to determine his exact date. He is often quoted by later rhetoricians with high esteem. His Kāvyālaṁkāra[1] is written in ślokas and treats in six sections of the "body of poetry", the embellishments, the faults, the logic and grammatical correctness of poetry. In the introductory verses Bhāmaha refutes the idea that one can become a poet only through mastery of rhetorics, and stresses the importance of poetic genius:

adhanasyeva dātṛtvaṁ klībasyevāstrakauśalam |
ajñasyeva pragalbhatvam akaveḥ śāstravedanam ||
"Like generosity to a beggar,
Or like bravery to a coward,
Or proficiency in arts to the unlettered,
Rhetoric science hath no meaning,
To one, who is not a poet."
vinayena vinā kā śrīḥ kā niśā śaśinā vinā |
rahitā satkavitvena kīdṛśī vāgvidagdhatā ||
"What charm is there in beauty lacking grace ?
Or there in night's wan moonless face ?
Or without poetic touch or fling or trace,
What sort of beauty one finds in words ?"
akavitvam adharmāya vyādhaye daṇḍanāya vā |
kukavitvaṁ tu punaḥ sākṣān mṛtim āhurmanīṣiṇaḥ ||
"To miss the poetic "mark" is just a lack in (physical, mental, social) health ; naught more.
But to have taste's ah, unpoetic worse :
'tis deardly, death itself, an irrevocable sore".

It is apparent that he flourished later than Kālidāsa, since I, 42 (as W. in spite of Nobel, ZDMG 73, 192., believes) presupposes an acquaintance with Meghadūta. See also Hari Chand, Kālidāsa, p. 70 ff. [Keith, Sans. Lit. p. 375 ff., considers Bhāmaha posterior to Daṇḍin, since Bhāmaha's defence of the distinction between kathā and ākhyāyikā seems especially directed against Daṇḍin's views on the subject. Bhāmaha certainly used the work of Uddyotakara (c.650 A.D.), and probably knew Nyāsa (c. 700)]. On Bhāmaha see also V. V. Sovani, Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume 392 f., and K.P. Trivedī, 401ff. ibid. Bhāmaha's time is fixed to a point (as Jacobi has shown in an unpublished essay, communicated to W. on June 3, 1922 in course of a private talk) from the fact that he has quoted from Nyāyabindu of Dharmakīrti at two places, almost literally. According to Jacobi Bhāmaha lived later than 640 A.D. and Daṇḍin still later—towards the end of the 7th century A.D. This accords well with the fact that Daṇḍin in his Kāvyādarśa, II, 197 gives a reminiscence from Bāṇa's Kādambarī (see Peterson, Daśakumāracarita Ed., II, Preface p. 3, note). G.J. Agashe, Ind. Ant. 44, 1915, 67 f. would like to prove that Daśakumāracarita's Daṇḍin is different from Kāvyādarśa's. But his argument is not convincing.

1. Published in Appendix VIII to K. P. Trivedī's edition of the Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣana (BSS Nr. 65, 1909).

Probably in the 7th century A.D.[1] D a ṇ ḍ i n, himself a poet, wrote his K ā v y ā d a r ś a or "Mirror of Poetry"[2]. This manual of rhetorics is written in verses illustrating rules of poetics with numerous examples, mostly his own compositions.

Since the main doctrines, as enunciated by Daṇḍin, were sure to become a veritable standard for his successors to follow or emulate, it would not be out of place here to examine the contents of this book at some length for, in respect of time, Daṇḍin's organum closely precedes the chief works of Sanskrit poetry and so can offer to the reader a nice cross-section of what advice scholars and critic of India have to offer the poets.

According to Daṇḍin, every poem needs consist of a b o d y and an e m b e l l i s h m e n t[3]. By the body of a poem is understood the set of words in a sentence, set so as to suit the desired meaning. This set of words is capable of being put either in a metrical (padya), non-metrical (gadya) or mixed (miśra) style. For the metrical language he prescribes a large number of metres, measured either way : according to syllables or according to mora. One must learn this from metrics (chandoviciti), "which is a veritable ship for those who want to go across the vast ocean of poetry." But metre is not the most important thing in poetry. Kāvya, according to the general conception of Indian critics can be equally well written in verse or in prose. That is why

1. It is now certain that Daṇḍin was considered as an authority already in the 8th century A. D. J a c o b i (ZDMG 64, 1910, 138 f.) thinks that he could not have lived before the 7th century A.D., since he stands on a more advanced position, than Bhaṭṭi does. Cf. G.A. J a c o b, JRAS 1897, 284; L.D. B a r n e t t, JRAS 1905, 841 f.; B e r n h e i m e r, ZDMG 63, 1909, 709. ff.; P.V. K a n e, Ind. Ant. 1912, 128; G r a y, Vāsavadattā, p. 11. f. There exists a Tibetan translation of Daṇḍin's "Kāvyādarśa in the Tanjūr (G. H u t h, SBA 1895, 268; ZDMG 49, 283 f.). [A manuscript of this work has recently been acquired for the Sanskrit University Museum, Vārāṇasī.]

2. Sanskrit and German published by O, B ö h t l i n g k, Leipzig 1890. Besides more often in Indian editions.

[K e i t h, Sans. Lit. p. 296 ff. thinks for certain reasons that Kāvyādarśa was written definitely before Bhāmaha. (C. 700 A.D.)... and the chief impression conveyed by the Daśakumāracarita is that its geography contemplates a stage of things anterior to the empire of Harṣavardhana and that its comparative simplicity suggests a date anterior to the works of Subandhu and of Bāṇa. Cf. also Collins—The Geographical Data of the Raghuvaṁśa.

3. *taiḥ śarīraṁ ca kāvyānāmalaṁkārāśca darśitāḥ* |
śarīraṁ tāvadiṣṭārthavyavacchinnā padāvalī ||
padyaṁ catuṣpadī tacca vṛttaṁ jātiriti dvidhā |
chandovicityāṁ sakalastatprabandho nidarśitaḥ ||
sā vidyā naustitīrṣūṇāṁ gambhīraṁ kāvyasāgaram ||]

the nature of poetry is not rigidly fixed. No Indian could ever imagine that versification might become poetry too. When, for example, a scientific work is written in verses, as so frequently is met with in India, it might be said that it belonged to poetry. Grammars, dictionaries, astronomical or medical works written in verse are not poems, but manuals written in verse, able to impress memory more easily than if written in prose. However, there are truly scientific works that are in touch poetic as well; for instance the Bṛhatsaṁhitā of Varāhamihira. On the contrary when a prose novel is endowed with all the possible alaṁkāras in accordance with the rules, it belongs to kāvya, as a class and, in fact, is as good a poetry as an epic.

It is further explicitly stated that good poetry can be composed equally well in Sanskrit, in Prākrit, or in Apabhraṁśa (a literary dialect or a spoken idiom). In fact Indian poets have successfuly employed kāvya style for both Prākrit and Sanskrit poetry. The same writers have sometimes expressed themselves with equal facility in Sanskrit as well as in Prākrit. In general, the same rules are valid both for Prākrit and Sanskrit kāvya, at least by imitation[1].

Daṇḍin next formulates the rules that hold good for a literary epic (sargabandha, mahākāvya) :

sargabandho mahākāvyam ucyate tasya lakṣaṇam ।
āśīrnamaskriyā vastunirdeśo vāpi tanmukham ॥
itihāsakathodbhūtamitarad eva sadāśrayam ।
caturvargaphalāyattaṁ caturodāttanāyakam ॥
nagarārṇavaśailartucandrārkodayavarṇanaiḥ ।
udyānasalilakrīḍāmadhupānaratotsavaiḥ ।
vipralambhair vivāhaiśca kumārodayavarṇanaiḥ ॥
alaṁkṛtamasaṁkṣiptaṁ rasabhāvanirantaram ।
sargairanativistīrṇaiḥ śravyavṛttaiḥ susandhibhiḥ ॥

"It should begin with a benediction, a homage or an indication of the subject-matter. The plot should be built either upon a legend, a romance or an historical fact, suggestive as to how the four ends of life are to be attained, depicting the adventures of a hero, overflowing with wisdom and nobility. Descriptions of the town, the sea, the mountain, the seasons,

1. Cf. Bühler, Die indischen Inschriften etc., p. 59 and Jacobi, ZDMG, 48, 415 f.

rising of the moon and the sun, sports in pleasure-gardens or in tanks, drink banquets, love-scenes, feasts, marriages, birth of a son, conferences, emissaries, war expeditions, battles and sieges by heroes etc. go to the making of what it is an epic. The plot should be so developed as to be permeated by one basic sentiment (rasa) along with its corresponding emotion (bhāva). It shall consist of a number of cantos (sargas), not too long, composed in properly rhythmical and suitable verses". Daṇḍin then proceeds to describe prose kāvya and its varieties and the mixture of both, to which class the drama and the campū belong. In this connection he touches on the subject of employment of the different languages and dialects in poetry, in the end dealing with the different kinds of style. He says that there is a number of styles, but that they do not differ much one from another. A sharp distinction exists only between the Vaidarbha and the Gauḍa styles[1]. Cohesion, clarity, evenness, grace and tenderness are the characteristics of the Vaidarbha, while the Gauḍa inclines more towards obscurity and bombast, delighting in exaggerations and has special fascination for long compounds[2]. Thus, for example, whilst a poet in the Vaidarbha style said—

anayoranavadyāṅgi stanayorjṛmbhamānayoḥ ।
avakāśo na paryāptastava bāhulatāntare ॥
"Thy pair of budding breasts,
O maiden, with faultless limbs,
Between thy creeper-like arms,
Misses space enough for growth";

a Gauḍa poet would express to same thus—

alpaṁ nirmitamākāśam anālocyaiva vedhasā ।
idam evaṁvidhaṁ bhāvi bhavatyāḥ stanajṛmbhaṇam ॥
"O lovelist mine, the Creator,
Not foreseeing thy bosom's posibilities to outgrew itself,
left the world too narrow ('tween thy arms)".

1. Vidarbha is the country of modern Berar. Gauḍa, the country of modern Bengal. From the exposition of Daṇḍin we see that there existed great local variations in style. It is attested by Bāṇa in Harṣacarita, introductory verse 8.

[2. *śleṣaḥ prasādaḥ samatā mādhuryaṁ sukumāratā* ।
arthavyaktirudāratvamojaḥkāntisamādhayaḥ ॥
iti vaidarbhamārgasya prāṇā daśa guṇāḥ smṛtāḥ ।
teṣāṁ viparyayaḥ prāyo dṛśyate gauḍavartmani ॥]

In the description of these different types of style (rīti) the writer stresses that alaṁkāras or "the embellishments" are all in all in poetry. And the fact that Daṇḍin hardly devotes one-sixth of his work to the "body" of poetry, the rest being occupied only with a discussion about the "embellishments," clearly shows what significance is attached to the latter in Indian poetics. The alaṁkāras, defined as the "attributes, that lend glitter (beauty) to poetry", have been analysed exhaustively and elaborately. Which done, i.e. only after that, the writer proceeds with "embellishments of the sense" (arthālaṁkāras) and "embellishments of the sound" (śabdālaṁkāras). To the first category belong natural description, the simile and the metaphor. According to Daṇḍin, there are thirty-two kinds of simile (upamā). He illustrates, e.g., how one could express in twenty-five different ways the beauty of a lotus-face. One can say—

rājīvamiva te vaktraṁ netre nīlotpale iva |

"Thy face red like a thy at bloom, thine eyes like lotuses blue",

or

tavānanamivāmbhojam ambhojamiva te mukham

"The lotus is like thy face and thy face is like the lotus,"

or

yadi kiṁcid bhavet padmaṁ subhru vibhrāntalocanam |
tatte mukhaśriyaṁ dhattām

"If but the lotus had two rolling disturbed eyes, one would think it was thy face ;"

or

śatapatraṁ śaraccandrastvadānanam iti trayam |
parasparavirodhi

"The lotus, the autumnal moon and thy face—what a triple paradox !;"

or

tvadānanam adhīrākṣam āvirdaśanadīdhiti |
bhramadbhṛṅgamivālakṣyakesaraṁ bhāti paṅkajam ||

"Thy face, with quivering eyes and glimmering teeth, is like a lotus-flower, swarmed over by bees, from where little visible filaments are moving upward".

Closely related to the simile is the m e t a p h o r (rūpaka). There are metaphors that appropriately belong to the standing

vocabulary of the poet, as: *mukhacandra* "face-moon", *bāhulatā* "arm-creeper", *hastapadma* "hand-lotus" etc.

An amplified rūpaka is illustrated by:—

aṅgulyaḥ pallavānyāsan kusumāni nakhārciṣaḥ ।
bāhulatā vasantaśrīstvaṁ naḥ pratyakṣacāriṇī ॥

"Thy fingers are the leaves; the rays (issuing) from thy nails, the flowers;
Thy two arms, the two creepers: the vernal beauty vividly moving before us, thou art."

Among the embellishments of meaning (arthālaṅkāra), very often is met with the ā k ṣ e p a, that is to say, the concealed or roguish reproof or opposition, as in the stanza beautifully translated by Th. Aufrecht[1]:

gaccheti vaktumicchāmi tvatpriyaṁ matpriyaiṣiṇi ।
niragacchan mukhād vāṇī mā gā iti karomi kim ॥

"I wanted to speak what you like—
Thou must now go away;
Yet the mouth, obedient to the inclination
Of my heart, stammers forth 'Hasten not'."

Daṇḍin mentions the h y p e r b o l e (atiśayokti) as the best of embellishments. Śleṣa (p u n) or double-meaning is very much liked by the poets. "The śleṣa heightens beauty in all figurative expressions (vakrokti)", says Daṇḍin (II, 363) Thus, for example, in a panegyric verse, in which the king is compared with the moon, it is said :—

asāvudayamārūḍhaḥ kāntimān raktamaṇḍalaḥ ।
rājā harati lokasya hṛdayaṁ mṛdubhiḥ karaiḥ ॥

"This *king* (moon), *who has attained the peak of prosperity* (has risen), who is *beautiful* (lovely), *who has made people loyal* (red orb), enchants the heart of his *dependants* (the people) with his *mild taxes* (rays)[2].

1. ZDMG 16, 749 ff., Kāvyādarśa II, 147.

2. II, 311. The words in Italics in the translation have two meanings; the second meaning has been given within brackets. The K e n-y ō g e n of Japanese poetry is much similar to Śleṣa. Cf. K. F l o r e n z, Geschichte der Japanischen Litteratur, Leipzig 1906, p. 27 f; W i n t e r-n i t z, Mitteilungen der Anthropolog. Gesellschaft in Wien. Bd. 35, 1905, p. 240, and J. T a k a k u s u, JRAS 1905, 871 ff. The kāvya-style has all through manifold parallels in Chinese and Japanese poetry. See F l o-r e n z, ibid. p. 129f., 148, 154. On similar aspects in other literatures, see G r a y, Vāsavadattā, p. 32 ff.

To the embellishments of sound belong, in particular, the numerous types of the y a m a k a, poetic rhyme, (in which a good number of syllables, that stand in immediate proximity or are separated by other syllables, are repeated). Such a repetition may appear in the beginning or in the middle or at the end of a foot. The same series of syllables, when repeated, have, nevertheless, different meanings. Thus, for example, a verse reads :

pātu vo bhagavān viṣṇuḥ sadā navaghanadyutiḥ ।
sa dānava-kuladhvaṁsī sa dāna-varadantihā ॥[1]

All sorts of possible poetical devices are made here and there. Thus, for example, there is a stanza in which the two syllables *k ā* and *l a* are repeated twenty-four times. Or else, a stanza may consist of identically sounding quartets, each having a different meaning. It may be that two stanzas, that have different meanings, have wholly identical lines and, according to sense going together, follow one another.

There are, further, most highly refined poetical pieces made of syllables, set together for being read in an inverse direction or in a zig-zag manner or from above downward or from below upward. Another poetical device requires that stanzas should be composed with nothing but a limited number of vowels and consonants.

Of the numerous types and sub-types of embellishments Daṇḍin treats only a few in his poetics.

Whilst the oldest Indian rhetoricians like Daṇḍin were satisfied with defining and classifying the alaṁkāras and with rejecting the view that the essence of poetry lay in embellishments, V ā m a n a, who lived about 800 A.D. in the court of the King Jayāpīḍa of Kashmir[2], first of all raised the question about the true nature of poetry and answered it by saying *rītirātmā kāvyasya*, "the soul of poetry abides in the style," i.e., in combination of certain excellences of diction. His K ā v y ā-l a ṁ k ā r v ṛ t t i[3] consists of a theoretical section on aesthetics

1. May the exalted Viṣṇu, who has brilliance of a fresh cloud, who destroyed the race of the dānavas and killed the chief of the elephants in rut, protect you. (III, 28).

2. He was a minister of this king, who ruled between the years 779-813 A.D. See J a c o b i, ZDMG 64, 1910, 138 ff.

3. Vāmanas Lehrbuch der Poetik, published for the first time by C. C a p p e l l e r, Jena 1875; published also in Km. 15, 1889. [Vāmana's

and a practical section on grammar. The latter[1] contains rules on prosody and grammar, in which, with regard to the rules of Pāṇini's grammar, the poet is advised as to how he should be able to write in correct Sanskrit.

A contemporary and rival of Vāmana was U d b h a ṭ a, who was posted in the court of the same king as the chief paṇḍita (sabhāpati)[2]. He wrote a work A l a ṁ k ā r a s a ṅ - g r a h a[3], "Short Synopsis of the Essence of Poetics", in which he is said to have stated that the soul of poetry is to be found in sentiment (rasa). The ascription to him of this doctrine has been proved to be wrong, as it was based on the error of ascribing to him a verse cited by Pratihārendurāja. But it is true that Udbhaṭa stressed the importance of sentiment in poetry and added Ś ā n t a r a s a to the list of eight sentiments of Bharata, thus making it nine. He further introduced a new classification, based entirely on sound effects, primarily alliteration, in the shape of a theory of vṛttis, manners, classed as elegant (upanāgarikā), ordinary (grāmyā) and harsh (paruṣā). In treating embellishments, he adds Dṛṣṭānta and Kāvyaliṅga, and divides simile according to the grammatical form of expression...and starts the investigation into the relation of double meaning to other figures... as well as complex issue of the different kinds of blendings of figures, saṁsṛṣṭi and saṁkara. He himself composed an epic Kumārasaṁbhava, from which he quotes examples in his poetics, and wrote B h ā m a h a v i v a r a ṇ a, a commentary on Bhāmaha's poetics, that is not available.

The alleged theory, that sentiment is the soul of poetry, wrongly ascribed to Udbhaṭa, formed the basis of the D h - v a n i k ā r i k ā s, 120 metrical kārikās on poetics by some

Kāvyālaṁkārasūtravṛtti (with Vāgbhaṭālaṁkāra and Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa had been published by Anundoram B o r o o h, Calcutta, 1883. An English translation of Vāmana's sūtras and vṛtti had been published in Indian Thought, 3 and, 1912. The name of the book is Kāvyālaṁkārasūtrāṇi svīya-vṛttisametāni (Bombay 1958 ; 4th Ed. Vāṇīvilāsa Press 1909. trans. G. Jha. Its III and IV, reprinted, Poona, several times). "Rīti is specified arrangement of words, the term specified referring to distinction according to the qualities possessed as being the cause of charm in poetry."—K e i t h, HSL. p. 381.]

1. Treated by C. C a p p e l l e r, Vāmanas Stilregeln, Strassburg, 1880.

2. Rājataraṅgiṇī IV, 495. Cf. B ü h l e r, Report 64 f.

3. Published by J a c o b, JRAS 1897, 829-853. [The name of the book is given as Alaṁkārasangraha, K e i t h, HSL p. 383, where the work is reported to have been published also in BSS 1925.]

anonymous writer[1], upon which Ā n a n d a v a r d h a n a of Kashmir, about 850 A.D.[2], wrote a running and learned commentary D h v a n y ā l o k a[3] (which in fact is an independent work on the nature of poetry). According to Ānandavardhana, all good poetry has two meanings, the spoken one or denotation, that is to say, what is expressed by words and is embellished by alaṁkāras and the implied or concealed one, that is, what is inferred by the reader or the hearer. And in this implied one (that is designated as d h v a n i or tone) lies the real soul of poetry. The alaṁkāras, including m e t a p h o r and other poetical figures, thereby, become so much more impressive that they even hint at the implied meaning, that is purely suggested, "in the same way as the bodice covers the breasts and nevertheless lends them more charm". Above all the feeling and sentiment (rasa) belong to the unspoken. Accordingly Ānandavardhana distinguishes between three types

1. Generally he is known simply as "D h v a n i k ā r a, the author (of memorial verses) on dhvani". It is not likely that he was called Sahṛdaya, as V.V. S o v a n i tries to prove (JRAS, 1910, 164 ff.), since at best it is an epithet. Sushil Kumar D e, BSOS I 4, 1920 p. 1 ff. attempts to answer the question as to who was Dhvanikāra but arrives merely at the conclusion that he must have been at least one hundred years earlier than Ānandavardhana. Subsequently the latter became such a strong single advocate of the dhvani—theory that people did not distinguish between the Dhvanikāra and the Vṛttikāra.

2. Ānandavardhana wrote during the period of the reign of Avantivarman of Kashmir (855-883). There is a verse on him in Rājaśekhara (See P e t e r s o n, Subh. p. 9 ff): "To whom Ānandavardhana is not an *ānandavardhana* (that is to say, an increaser of pleasure) with his well thought dhvani permeating into the deep essence of poetry ?".

3. Published with the commentary of Abhinavagupta in Km. 25, 1891. Translated into German by H. J a c o b i in ZDMG 56 and 57 (separately printed, Leipzig, 1903). On this translation is based A. D y r o f f, "Eine indische Ästhetik" in the Archiv für Philosophie, 1. Abt. 18, Bd.(N.F. 11 Bd.), 1904, p. 113ff. Dyroff, praising the aesthetics of Ānandavardhana says that like that of Aristotle it happens to be empirical and proceeds like modern aesthetic psychology. [Translated into Hindī by V i ś v e ś v a r a, Delhi, 1952. In the Introduction, p. 72 ff, Viśveśvara, agreeing with S a n k a r a n (Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit), refutes this view on the strength of the words *asmadupajña* "established by ourselves" in the stanza "*iti kāvyārthavivekoyaṁ cetaścamatkṛtividhāyī* । *sūribhir anusṛtasārair asmadupajño na vismāryaḥ* ॥" and on the strength of the concluding stanza of the Dhvanyāloka that reads :

satkāvyatattvanayavartmaciraprasupta-
kalpaṁ manassu paripakvadhiyāṁ yadāsīt ।
tad vyākarot sahṛdayodayalābhahetor-
ānandavardhana iti prathitābhidhānaḥ ॥

But this view is not tenable as in both these places the references to self by Ānandavardhana may be with respect to his commentary.]

of poetry: (1) true poetry, in which the unspoken part is dominant; (2) poetry of the second grade, in which the unspoken part plays a secondary rôle and serves merely as a decoration for the spoken; and (3) the lowest grade of poetry, in which the whole importance is attached to the beauty of language and to external elaboration. According to this theory, indeed as Ānandavardhana himself says, only a few would emerge as real poets :

> *yenāsminnativicitre kaviparaṁparāvāhini saṁsāre kālidāsāmaru-prabhṛtayo dvitrāḥ pañcaṣā vā mahākavayo gaṇyante* । "Hence there are two or three or at the most five or six real poets like Kālidāsa, Amaru etc. in this very strange world". It is appreciable that this peculiar theory on aesthetics is not universally recognised.

A little later than Ānandavardhana, K u n t a k a wrote his V a k r o k t i j ī v i t a[1] (first half of the 10th century A.D.). [Perhaps he was a contemporary of Abhinavagupta][2]. By him crooked speech (vakrokti), i. e., figurative speech depending upon witty turnings, is considered to be the soul of poetry. He teaches that "it is to the inventive genius exerted in the work of a poet (kavikarman) that we owe the presence of vakrokti in any poem, and this work can be classed according as he exhibits it in regard to the letters, to the base or terminations of words, to the sentence, to the particular topic or to the treatise as whole"[3].

Whilst this theory may be considered to be a modification of the dhvani-theory, the teachings of Ānandavardhana were severely criticised by B h a ṭ ṭ a n ā y a k a (end of 9th century A.D.) in the H ṛ d a y a d a r p a ṇ a and by P r a t i h ā r a I n d u r ā j a, [a pupil of Mukula] (first half

1. Cf. J a c o b i, ZDMG 56, 1902, p. 400, 62, 1908, p. 296; T. G a-ṇ a p a t i Ś ā s t r ī, TSS No. V, 5ff. According to H a r i C h a n d a, Kālidāsa p. 96 ff., the anonymous writer of Vakroktijīvita would be anterior to Kuntaka. [The work has been edited by S. K. D e, Calcutta, 1923 and 1928 ; published with annotation in Hindī by Ācārya Viśveśvara, Delhi, 1955. The name of the author is given as K u n t a l a by K e i t h, HSL., p. 392 ff.].

2. See V i ś v e ś v a r a, Introduction p. 12 ff. to his edition of Vakrokti-jīvita.

3. Kārikās 18 ff.

of 10th century) in his commentary on Udbhaṭa's Alaṁkārasaṁgraha[1].

A very valuable and interesting treatise on poetics is the Kāvyamīmāṁsā of the poet Rājaśekhara[2]. He quotes verses from his three dramas. He describes in detail as to how a sabhā should be designed. In a fuller detail he states things about poets and kings: for example, he says that Sātavāhana, the king of Kuntala, had ordered exclusive use of Prākrit in his harem and that as against this, Sāhasāṅka of Ujjayinī had ordered for exclusive use of Sanskrit. In the introduction to a printed edition, the age of Rājaśekhara has been given as 880-920 A.D., and there it has been conjectured that the stanzas on poets cited in Jalhaṇa's Sūktimuktāvalī[3] have been taken from the Harivilāsa of Rājaśekhara; whilst there are others who ascribe the authorship of a work Kāvyavimarśa to him and hold that these stanzas were contained in this work. Hemacandra, as well as Vāgbhaṭa has very much used the Kāvyamīmāṁsā[4].

Towards, the close of the 10th and beginning of the 11th century A.D. Abhinavagupta[5] wrote his Dhvanyālokālocana, a great commentary on the Dhvanyāloka, which is rather an independent theoretical work, intelligible with difficulty. A work in which Ānandavardhana and Kuntaka are severely criticised is the Vyaktiviveka of Mahimahabhaṭṭa[6] (beginning of 11th century A.D.).

Not much later than Ānandavardhana lived Rudraṭa[7],

1. Cf. Pischel, Rudraṭa's Śṛṅgāratilaka, p. 11 f. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, ibid; Kane, Ind. Ant. 1912, 203ff; V.V. Sovani, JRAS 1909, 450 ff. According to Peterson, Subh. p. 11, Indurāja was a teacher of Abhinavagupta, but according to Aufrecht, CC I, 59, he is to be distinguished from Pratīhārendurāja.

2. Ed. C.D. Dalal and Anantakrishna Shastrī in the Gaekwar's Oriental Series No. 1, Baroda, 1916.

3. See below, p. 36.

4. Cf. also D. Barnett in BSOS 1917, 123 ff.

5. He was a Śaiva Brāhmaṇa and also author of one Nāṭyalocana, a commentary on Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra and also of religious and didactic poems. Cf. Bühler, Report 6 f., Krishnamacharya 162 f.; Hari Chanda, Kalidāsa, p. 96 ff.

6. Published with the commentary of Rājānaka Ruyyaka by Gaṇapati Śāstrī, TSS No. V, 1909, Cf. also Narasimhiengar, JRAS. 1908, 63 ff.

7. According to Jacobi, ZDMG 56, 763 A, he lived under Avantivarman (855 - 833). This Rudraṭa, with the epithet Śatānanda, son of Vāmuka, should not be confused with Rudrabhaṭṭa, the author of Śṛṅgāratilaka. Pischel (ZDMG 39, 314; 42, 296ff.) regards both of them

who in his Kāvyālaṁkāra takes no notice of the theory of dhvani, but assigns the chief importance upon alaṁkāras[1].

The most famous work on dramaturgy, that overthrows the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra and has replaced it, is the Daśarūpa[2] "The Treatise on the ten kinds of Drama" of Dhanañjaya, the son of Viṣṇu, who lived during the reign of Vākpatirāja II of Muñja (974-979 A.D.)[3]. His younger brother Dhanika[4] wrote a commentary on this work. The Daśarūpa is more lucid and systematic than the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra and, therefore, is quoted most frequently in later works on poetics. It is written in verses, mostly in ślokas, but the style is so concise that without the commentary it is hardly intelligible.

One of the most famous works on poetics is the Kāvyaprakāśa[5] of the Kashmiri Brāhmaṇa Mammaṭa (11th century A. D.)[6]. He is dependent mostly upon Udbhaṭa and Rudraṭa. According to him the best poetry is that with implied meaning (dhvani). The large numer

as identical. They are frequently confused in anthologies (see Thomas, 92ff.). Cf. However, Jacobi, WZKM 2, 151 ff. and ZDMG 42, 425 ff.: Jacob JRAS 1897, 291 f; Narasimhiengar JRAS 1905, 542 n.

1. Published with the commentary of Namisādhu in Km. 2, 1886. Nami, a Śvetāmbara Jaina wrote his commentary in 1068.

2. Published by Fitzedward Hall, Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1865 and by K. P. Parab, Bombay 1897 and again 1941. The text of Hall's edition was reprinted with an English translation by G. C. O. Haas (CUIS 7, New York 1912). Besides, cf. Jacobi, GGA, 1913, 302 ff.; and Barnett, JRAS 1913, 190 ff.

3. Bühler, Ep. Ind. I, 226f.

4. According to S. Lévi (JA 1886, s. 8, t. VII, 221), Jacobi and others Dhanika is just another name of Dhanañjaya.

5. Editions have appeared in BSS 1901 and, (with a commentary) in Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series No. 66, Poona 1911, [reprinted from its fifth edition in B.O.S. Poona, 2nd Ed. 1950]. An English translation by Gaṅgānātha Jhā in the Pandit, N.S. Vols. 18—21, revised edition Poona, 1936. Cf. V. Sukthankar ZDMG, 66, 1912, 477ff, 533ff.

6. Mammaṭa, son of Jayyaṭa, may have been a brother of the grammarian Kaiyaṭa and of the Vedic scholar Uvaṭa. On his age cf. Narasimhiengar, JRAS 1908, 63ff. and Gaṇapati Śāstrī, TSS No. V, p. 8 ff. In the opinion of many later rhetoricians Mammaṭa was the author of only the commentary on the kārikās, whose writer was Bharata. (But Bharata is quoted by Mammaṭa himself in Kāvyaprakāśa IV). The Sāhityakaumudī, published in Km. 63, 1897, by Vidyābhūṣaṇa, a disciple of the reformer Caitanya (born 1484 A.D.), probably may have been a commentary on the kārikās. The commentary and the manuscripts attest that Allaṭa (or Alaṭa, many manuscripts wrongly give Alaka) had worked upon the Kāvyaprakāśa in addition to Mammaṭa. Cf. Hari Chanda, Kālidāsa, p. 104.

of commentaries that had been written on the Kāvyaprakāśa attest to the prestige and honour this work enjoyed and the extent to which it was studied and used[1].

In the 11th century Kṣemendra, another Kashmirian [and a disciple of Bhaṭṭagaṅgana and of Abhinavagupta (980-1020 A.D.)], wrote an aesthetico-critical work Aucityālaṁkāra or Aucitya-vicāracarcā[2], that is to say "Critical Research on Proprieties in Poetry", and a practical handbook for poets, the Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa or "the Ornament for the Neck of the Poets"[3]. It is doubtful whether this is identical with his Kavikarṇikālaṅkāra, not yet found but referred to in his Aucitya[4].

In Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa the rules for the guidance of the poets are given directly more in a pedantic style than in a witty form. ["His position is that aucitya (appropriateness) is the essence of rasa.... His method is to give an appropriate definition of each topic and also to cite an inappropriate example thereon[5]."]

A comprehensive work on poetics is the Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa[6], "Ornament of the Neck of Sarasvatī (the Goddess of Speech)" of which the authorship is ascribed to the famous king Bhoja of Dhārā (11th century). Bhoja distinguishes between three classes of alaṁkāras—besides śabdālaṅkāra and arthālaṅkāra, there is also the one in which both śabda and artha are joined together at the same time. He sub-divides each of them further into 24. According to his theory there is a single sentiment, namely erotic, present in poetry. He,

1. On the commentaries, cf. Peterson, Report II, p. 10ff; 3 Reports pp. VIIff.; 19, 320ff., 332f.; Bühler, Report 68f. and Ind. Ant. 14, 353 f.; Jhā in the preface to his translation. The oldest commentary is that of Māṇikyacandra (1159 A.D.); the most famous commentary on Kāvyaprakāśa is the Kāvyapradīpa (published in the Pandit, N.S. Vols. 10-13). [For a list of commentaries on Kāvyaprakāśa, see Kane, ibid, Index, 388ff.]

2. Published in Km. Part 1, 115-160. On the authors cited in this work, see Peterson, JBRAS 16, 1885, 167ff.

3. Published in Km. Part IV, 122-139. An analysis of the work has been given by I. Schönberg, SWA 1884.

[4. Kaṇe HSP 253.]

[5. Further information on Kṣemendra in Bühler, Kashmir, Report p. 45 ff., JBRAS, Vol. 16, pp. 5-9; De, HSP Vol. I, p. 142 ff and Kane, HSP, p. 253ff.]

6. Published by A. Boorah, Calcutta 1884, [in KM Series, 1934, Benares 1887, and in the Madras University Series.]

however, attaches more importance to the merit of composition (guṇa) that generates the sentiment than to the alaṁkāras. If there is a poem that has several embellishments in it, but lacks in guṇa, it is not beautiful like a woman lacking in youth, just though she is splendidly decorated. As for the rest, Bhoja slavishly follows Daṇḍin[1], although he himself is frequently quoted in Kāvyaprakāśa. The chief merit of the work of Bhoja lies in the fact that he cites in it a number of stanzas—including those in Prākrit too[2]. Consequently, it can justly be considered as an anthology as well.

[Another work of Bhoja on poetics is the Śṛṅgāraprakāśa[3]. It is a very voluminous work, larger than any work on Sanskrit poetics. It deals with both poetics and dramaturgy, like the Sāhityadarpaṇa. It defines kāvya as *śabdārthau sahitau:* "word and meaning, both, jointly constitute poetry" and propounds that the erotic sentiment (śṛṅgāra) combined with consciousness (abhimāna) and individualization (ahaṁkāra) is the only rasa, properly so called. In this work a new rasa, i.e., vatsala, has been added to the list of nine, and in the opinion of the author vīra, adbhuta, etc., have been so considered just to respect the popular usage (*gatān ugatikatvavaśāt*).

Like Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa this work too deals with both poetics and grammar including philosophy of language. According to this, a word can have three vṛttis:—*mukhyā*, that is conventional, *gauṇī*, that is secondary and *lakṣaṇā*. As the work is not yet completely published it is not possible to say anything finally as regards its contents. It is noteworthy that like Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa this too contains a very large number of stanzas, written both in Prākrit and Sanskrit and, likewise, deserves to be considered an anthology.]

Towards close of the 11th and in the first half of the 12th century A.D., also the Jaina Vāgbhaṭa[4], son of Soma,

1. Nobel, Beitträge etc. p. 80.

2. R. Pischel, Materialien zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṁśa (AGGW, N.F. Bd. V, Nr. 4, 1902), p. 46 ff. gives a critical compilation and a German translation of the Prākrit stanzas of Bhoja.

[3. V. Raghavan—Studies in Śṛṅgāraprakāśa (Vol. I, parts 1 and 2, pp. 1—542). Only the first eight chapters have been published by G. R. Josyer, Mysore, 1945. There are many lacunae in the published edition.]

4. He was a minister under Jayasiṁha [of Aṇahillapāṭakapura,] Gujarāt (1093-1154) and is considered also to be the author of Neminirvāṇa, see above II, 338, tr. p. 512. [See also Kane, HSL, p. 275-276.]

wrote his Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra[1] in ślokas (1125-1143 A.D.). A later work is the Kāvyānuśāsana[2] of Vāgbhaṭa, son of Nemikumāra, in sūtras with his own commentary. The famous Jaina monk and polymath Hemacandra wrote a work on poetics under the title Kāvyānuśāsana[3] in sūtras with his own commentary, called Alaṅkāracūḍamaṇi. The commentary contains an extra-ordinarily rich collection of metrical examples in Sanskrit as well as in Prākrit.

Rājānaka Ruyyaka (or Rucaka), who is held in high esteem as a theorist on poetry, wrote in the beginning of the 12th century A.D. the much read work Alaṁkārasarvasva[4], "Everything of Embellishment". He wholly depends upon his predecessors, especially Mammaṭa. His credit lies chiefly in the fact that he adopts the scientific style, for he was well disciplined in philosophical literature. When he refers to the views of Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa, Rudraṭa and Vāmana, he speaks about them collectively: "Therefore, so goes the opinion of the older writers—that alaṁkāras constitute the chief constituents of poetry". Following this he deals in detail with the definition and classification of alaṁkāras, of which he treats not less than 82.

1. Published in Km. 43, 1894.

2. Published in Km. 48, 1895. Generally only one Vāgbhaṭa (known also under the Prākrit name Bāhaḍa) is assumed : so by Aufrecht, CC. I, 103, 559; II, 132; III, 118 etc. See, however, Bernheimer, ZDMG, 63, 1909, 808 note 1. See also Zachariae, GGA 1884, 301 ff, and Jacob, JRAS 1897, 308 f. Weber, HSS. Verz. II, 3, p. 1208, differentiates the two Vāgbhaṭas.

3. Published in Km. 71, 1901. Cf. Bühler, Hemacandra, p. 33, 81.

4. Published with commentary in the Km. 35, 1893; translated by H. Jacobi into German, ZDMG 62, 1908. Ruyyaka is the son of Rājānaka Tilaka, author of Udbhaṭaviveka. He was the teacher of Maṇkha or Maṅkhuka. Ruyyaka and Maṅkhuka have a number of common stanzas, but none of them refers to the other by name. In the south Indian manuscripts (see Burnell, Tanjore, p. 54, and Winternitz, South Indian Manuscripts 208) the author of Alaṁkārasarvasva is mentioned as Maṅkhuka. Jacob (JRAS, 1897, 283f.) considers it possible that Ruyyaka was the author of both the sūtras and the commentary. See also Hari Chand, Kālidāsa, p. 105ff. Ruyyaka is the author also of Sahṛdayalīlā, (published by R. Pischel, Rudraṭa's Śṛṅgāratilaka und Ruyyaka's Sahṛdayalīlā, Kiel 1886, also in Km. Part V, 1888, 157—160), also of Kāvyaprakāśasaṁketa, a commentary on the Kāvyaprakaśa, and of many other works.

In the 12th century A.D., Rudra[1] or Rudrabhaṭṭa wrote Śṛṅgāratilaka, a work, which is a collection of erotic stanzas and a manual of poetics at the same time, and in it the erotic sentiment has been illustrated with examples. The small work contains stanzas purely composed by the author himself, only short superscriptions pointing as to what they are meant to serve as examples of. Many of the stanzas have been included in later anthologies. Th. Aufrecht[2] has beautifully translated into German the one (I, 3) addressed to the critics—here summarily referred to as rogues—

kāvye śubhepi racite khalu no khalebhyaḥ
kaścid guṇo bhavati yadyapi saṁpratīha ।
kuryāṁ tathāpi sujanārthamidaṁ yataḥ kiṁ
yūkābhayena paridhānavimokṣaṇaṁ syāt ॥

"Thou knowest, my friend, even if thou art the most wonderful poet,
Yet thou receiveth neither mercy, nor favour from the gang (of critics),
Still composeth thou for the pleasure of those who appreciate :
Would anybody give up wearing clothes for fear of lice ?"

A work on poetics of the type of Kāvyaprakāśa is Ekāvalī[3] of Vidyādhara, a metrical work with the author's own commentary. The examples are of the writer's own composition and are at the same time panegyrics of Narasiṁha, king of Utkala and Kaliṅga. This enables us to determine to some extent the age of the work. But, the difficulty is that there have been eight kings of this name. In any case apparently the

1. Falsely ascribed to Rudraṭa (see above p. 22, note 4) by Pischel in his edition of the text (see the above remark). The text has been published also in the Km. Part III, 111-152. [Rudra and Rudraṭa are considered identical by some scholars, but different persons by others. Kane, HSP, p. 147 ff. has discussed the question and expressed the opinion that "there are very weighty grounds for holding that the two are distinct authors". Cf. Bühler, Kashmir Report p. 67), Aufrecht (ZDMG, 36, p. 376), Pischel (ZDMG 42, 1888, p. 296) on the one hand and Jacobi WZKM 1888, II (p. 151 ff. and ZMDG 42, p. 425 ff.) and Hari Chanda, Kālidāsa p. 91 ff. on the other. "Rudraṭa is a son of Vāmuka and is also called Śatānanda" (Keith, HSL, p. 384, note.)]

2. ZDMG 25, 240. A number of stanzas have been translated into German by Hoefer, Indische Gedichte, II, 164 ff.

3. Published with the commentary of Mallinātha by K. P. Trivedi, BSS Nr. 63, 1903. Cf. Bhandarkar, Report 1887-1891, pp. (LXV)—(LXXI). In his commentary on the works of Kālidāsa, Mallinātha frequently refers to Ekāvalī.

patron referred to by our author seems to have ruled between 1279-1314 A.D.

Vidyādhara belongs to the Ānandavardhana's school of poetics. Interesting are his expositions of rasa in the third section. Enjoyment of the sentiment, he says, is "super-natural" (*alaukika*), like the ecstasy of meditation on Brahman (*brahmasvādasahodara*). This enjoyment is such a supermundane pleasure that one does not think of any other thing, but is completely plunged and lost therein. Just it is explained, as the spectacle of even a tragic or dreadful scene that generates pleasure only. The four chief sentiments, the erotic, the heroic, the dreadful and the disgustful, are explained beautifully in the following manner:—

vikāso kusumasyeva pādapasyeva vistaraḥ ।
kṣobhobdheriva vikṣepo mārutasyeva cetasaḥ ॥

tatra vikāsopādhikaḥ śṛṅgāraḥ । *vistaropādhiko vīraḥ* । *kṣobhopādhiko raudraḥ* । *vikṣepopādhiko bībhatsaḥ* ॥

"The erotic sentiment is like blossoming of a bud, the heroic one is similar to that of a tree outspreading with branches, the dreadful one is like the fury of an ocean and the disgustful one is like an whirlwind. With regard to excellence (guṇa) he refutes the view of Bhoja. As regards alaṁkāras, he substantially follows Ruyyaka, but frequently quotes Bhāmaha as well.

To the age of Ekāvalī belongs also the Pratāparudra-yaśobhūṣaṇa[1] of Vidyānātha. The work, that, in short, is generally called Pratāparudrīya, treats the entire sphere of poetics, including dramaturgy. Chapter one straightway describes the characteristics of the hero and of the heroine of the drama ; chapter two is devoted to the nature of poetry and to its different types, and chapter three discusses in detail the types of dramatic poetry (rūpaka), especially the nāṭaka. As a model for the latter, Vidyānātha has among his works the Pratāparudrakalyāṇa, a learned drama in five acts. Here all the examples are composed by the writer himself and all of them are panegyrics of the Pratāparudra of

1. Published with the commentary of Kumārasvāmin, son of Mallinātha, by K.P. Trivedī, BSS Nr. 65, 1909 [and by C. Śaṅkara Rāma Śāstrī, Madras, 3rd ed. 1950.]

Hyderabad (1268-1319)[1]—hence the title of the work "Ornament to the Fame of Pratāparudra". He follows in general Mammaṭa, but prefers Ruyyaka in his treatment of figures of speech.

B h ā n u d a t t a[2], son of Gaṇanātha of Mithilā[3], must have written his R a s a m a ñ j a r ī and R a s a t a r a ṅ g i ṇ ī[4] in the 13th century. The former consists of stanzas with explanatory prose and describes the heroes and heroines in the drama and the epic. The Rasataraṅgiṇī, in which Rasamañjarī too is mentioned, is devoted to sentiments, emotions, etc. It is a kind of commentary on chapters VI and VII of the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra. The work is in prose with numerous examples in verses for the greater part refering to Kṛṣṇa and Rāma.

During the period 1300-1380 A.D. V i ś v a n ā t h a Kavirāja[5] wrote his S ā h i t y a d a r p a ṇ a[6] (Mirror of Composition), that treats in detail of the entire range of poetics and dramaturgy. It is held in great esteem especially in respect of dramaturgy. In his discussion on the nature of poetry, as against Dhvanikāra as well as against Kuntaka, Bhoja and Mammaṭa, he defends his view that sentiment alone is the soul of poetry.

1. The inscrptions of Pratāparudra are of the period 1298—1327 A.D. Cf. E g g e l i n g, Ind. Off. Cat. III, p. 338. [According to K a n e, HSP, p. 283, 1271—1309 A.D.].

[2. On the question of indentity of Bhānukara and Bhānudatta, see H a r a d a t t a Ś a r m ā, Annals of the BORI, Vol. 17, p. 243ff. S. K. D e, ibid, p. 297 ff. and D e v a s t h a l i, NIA, Vol. VII, p. 111ff.]

3. P. R e g n a u d, La Rhétorique Sanskrite, p. 371; P i s c h e l, GGA 1885, 769.

4. Published by R e g n a u d as an appendix to the work mentioned above. [The work has been published also in the Benares Sanskrit Series.]

5. [He was a son of Chandraśekhara and a great grand'son of Nārāyaṇa.] Apparently he lived under Narasiṁha II, king of Orissa, between 1279 and 1306 A.D. Cf. M. C h a k r a v a r t i in JASB 72, 1903, p. 146 and N. S. 2, 1906, p. 167 note; A. B. K e i t h JRAS 1911, p. 848ff. Viśvanātha is the author of one Kāvyaprakāśadarpaṇa and of the poetical works Candrakalānāṭaka, Rāghavavilāsa and Narasiṁhavijaya too. In the Sāhityadarpaṇa, he more often cites from his drama Prabhāvatīpariṇaya and his Prākrit poem Kuvalayāśvacarita, (175, 561). He refers to his Praśastiratnāvalī, written in sixteen dialects, as an example of Karambhaka, that is a piece of poetic composition in several different dialects. [See also K a n e, HSP. p. 285 ff. Konow (Das indische Drama p. 3) holds with K.P. P a r a b and P.V. K a n e that probably Viśvanātha Kavirāja lived in the second half of the 14th century A.D.]

6. Published by E. R ö e r with an English translation of J. R. B a l l a n t y n e and P r a m a d r a D ā s a M i t r a, Bibl. Ind. 1851—1875. Reprinted Vārāṇasī, 1956. Recent edition by P. V. K a n e, Bombay 1910. [Hindi translation and annotation by Śāligrāma Śāstrī, Vārāṇasī, 3rd. ed. 1956.]

On the one hand he agrees with Udbhaṭa in respect of the theory of sentiments, on the other hand he follows Ruyyaka in his treatment of embellishments. In chapter six he deals with both the types of poetry—that is to be seen and that is to be heard. The first one generates sentiments through mimic representation and is called rūpaka, because it attains form (rūpa) through the actor. He has devoted kārikās 272-556 to dṛśyakāvya (poetry that is to be seen).

A type of elementary book on poetics form the Kuvalayānandakārikās[1] of Appaya Dīkṣita[2] with the commentary of Āśādhara. The work consists of metrical lines in which alaṁkāras are explained with examples. It is, however, an enlargement of the fifth chapter of a voluminous work on poetics, i.e., of Candrāloka or Alaṁkāranirūpaṇa of Jayadeva Pīyūṣavarṣa[3], son of Mahādeva. In respect of embellishments Jayadeva follows Ruyyaka. Appaya seems to have written another work named Lakṣaṇaratnāvalī, in which he defines dramatic technical words like nāndī, sūtradhāra, prastāvanā, pūrvaraṅga etc.

The last important writer on poetics is Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja, who wrote his Rasagaṅgā-

1. Edited and explained with an English Tīkā Commentary and Translation by P. R. Subrahmaṇya Sarmā, Calcutta, 1903. Translated into German by R. Schmidt, Berlin, 1907.

2. Appaya wrote this work according to the wish of the King Veṅkaṭa I of Pennakoṇḍa (1586-1613), see E. Hultzsch, Reports on Sanskrit MSS. in Southern India, II, p. XII f. and Ep. Ind. 4, 271; Nilmaṇi Chakravarti, JASB 1907, 211. According to Krishnamacharya 168, Appaya Dīkṣita lived during 1554-1626 A.D. and wrote not less than 104 learned works. He is the author also of another work on poetics, namely Citramīmāṁsā (published in the Pandit, N.S. Vol. 13 and in the Km. 38, 1893), in which is printed also the Citramīmāṁsā-khaṇḍana, "the Dismemberment of Citramīmāṁsā" of Jagannātha. Appaya is the author also of Vṛttivārttika (published in the Pandit NS. Vol. 12 and Km. 36, 1893). [Cf. JOR. Madras, IV, p. 242 ff; Kane, HSP, p. 306. On the date of Appaya given above, see Ep. Ind. XII, p. 340. Against this see Y. Mahāliṅga Śāstrī (JOR, Madras, III, p. 140ff.), who maintains that the date of Appaya would be between 1520 A.D. and 1593 A.D. Further references in Kane, HSP, p. 307ff.]

3. This Jayadeva does not seem to have written long before Appaya. Cf. Eggeling. Ind. Off. Cat. III, p. 332 f; Peterson, Subh. 37ff. and Bhaṭṭanāthasvāmin, Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 143 note. Pischel HL 17f. holds that Jayadeva was much older.

dhara[1] in the 17th century A.D. He refutes the theory of the implied meaning (dhvani) and defines the notion of beauty, even as Kant does, by saying: "Beauty is that of which the representation generates pleasure without interest".

Again, in the 18th century a learned Brāhmaṇa Devaśaṁkara combined panegyric and science in his one work Alaṁkāramañjūṣā, that deals with alaṁkāras only. All the examples cited are by the writer himself and written for the express purpose of describing the glory of Peshwa Mādhavarāo I and of his uncle Raghunātharāo (between 1761 and 1768 A.D.)'[2].

Prosody[3] in India is as old as poetics. Its beginnings go back as far as the Vedic literature. Already in the Brāhmaṇas we find people busy with metres, the harmony of which seems to have something mystic[4]. A number of chapters is devoted to prosody in the Sāṅkyhāyanaśrautasūtra. The Ṛgveda Prātiśākhya and metrical portions of Kātyāyana's Anukramaṇīs to the Ṛgveda and the Yajurveda already scientifically treat of the Chandas (that is to say, prosody) that is enlisted also among the six Vedāṅgas. The most important work of this Vedāṅga is the Chandassūtra of Piṅgala[5]. Although this work is called a Vedāṅga, it

1. Published with a commentary in Km. 15, 1889. The work was written in 1641 A.D., the year of death of Āsaf, the Supreme Commander-in-chief of Shāh Jahān. Jagannātha lived also in court of Dāra Shāh, son of Shāh Jahān, in between 1620 and 1660 as a lyric or sententious poet. Many unauthenticated sayings and anecdotes make him a contemporary of Emperor Akbar (see L.R. Vaidya in his introduction to Bhāminīvilāsa). His numerous works have been enlisted in Aufrecht, CCI, 196 and in Km. Part I, p. 79 note).

2. Bhandarkar, Report 1887-1891 p. (LXIII)ff. Several other works on poetics have been mentioned in Bühler, Report 64 ff. Burnel, Tanjore p. 54ff., Bhandarkar, Report 1882-1883, p. 12f., Report 1883 1884, p. 6, 17f., 155 f., 326; Peterson, Report IV, pp VIII, X, LXVIII f., CVII; Eggeling Ind. Off. Cat. III, 321ff. Keśavamiśra wrote in 1565 the Alaṁkāraśekhara (published in Km. 50, 1895; *te Nilamani Charavarti in JASB 1907, p. 212). A work of the 18th century is the Rasaratnahāra of Tripāṭhī Śivarāma, published in Km. Part VI, 1890, pp. 118-142.

3. Cf. Colebrooke, Misc. Essays II, 63 ff., Weber, Ind. Stud. Bd. 8; F. L. Pullé, F. Belloni-Filippi e A. Ballini in SIFI VIII. 1912; H. Jacobi, Über die Entwicklung der indischen Metrik in nachvedischer Zeit, ZDMG 38, 590ff., 40, 336ff.

4. See above, I, p. 56, 157 (trans. pp. 62,180).

5. See above I, p. 245 (trns. pp. 288-89). Text with the commentary Mṛtasaṁjīvanī of Halāyudha (2nd half of 10th century) published in Km. 91, 1908.

touches only a very small number of Vedic metres, its major part dealing with secular poetry. The names of his predecessors mentioned by Piṅgala exhibit a Vedic character ; in any case he is a very old writer, a thing that is indicated also by the circumstance that he is a mythical personality and as such is also called "Nāga—Piṅgalanāga". According to tradition he is identical with Patañjali; Ṣaḍguruśiṣya calls him a "younger brother of Pāṇini", and it is probable that he is not too far away in time from Patañjali (about 150 B.C.).

The names and number of the metres treated by Piṅgala equally prove that there existed a highly developed secular literature before his time. Besides, the names of many metres prove the existence of extensive love-lyrics. Names of the metres like Kanakaprabhā "brilliance of gold", Kuḍmaladantī "bud-toothed", Cāruhāsinī "beautifully-smiling", Vasantatilakā "Spring-crested", and others, apparently go to explain that originally they were employed in love lyrics, in which beautiful women were praised[1]. Besides them, however, there are also metres that are named according to their form and nature, e.g., Mandākrāntā "slowly ascending", Drutamadhyā "swift in the middle", and others. Many of the names bear resemblance to the voice or habit of animals e.g., Aśvalalita "horse-sport", Kokilaka "voice of the cuckoo", Śārdūlavikrīḍita "tiger-sport", etc.

In Vedic prosody, metre exclusively depends upon the number of syllables, and to a very limited extent the quality of syllables too is taken into account. Of these metres, the śloka of the epics, derived from the Vedic anuṣṭubh, is of the most frequent occurrence. Otherwise, prosody knows only the metres in which the number of syllables as well as their quantity too is strictly fixed. A large number of metres is formed according to the number of syllables and arrangement of metrical feet. The number of syllables in a quarter of a stanza (pada) varies between 5 to 27, so that we have stanzas of syllables numbering from 20 to 108. But theoretically there

1. The circumstance too speaks in support of the assumption that originally it was in the erotic lyrics that metres were used in India, since in this poetry the variety of metres is the greatest. Writers of epics use comparatively smaller number of metres. In the oldest dramas there occur approximately twenty metres.

exist yet a much greater number of metres, in fact, that are met with here and there. In addition there are a number of metres that are measured according to mora. They are found mainly in Prākrit poems and seem to have originally belonged to popular ballads.

Like Pāṇini in his grammar, Piṅgala uses algebraic expressions to indicate the feet of metres and for short and long syllables[1]. A work on Prākrit prosody too is ascribed to Piṅgala[2]. It is written in verses and contains a large number of recent prosodical expressions and, therefore, must be younger in age than his Chandaḥsūtra.

We do not know whether the authors of the works of ornate poetry that are before us were regulated according to Piṅgala or according to some later manual[3]. Later than Piṅgala's Chandaḥsūtra is chapter XV of the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra which deals with prosody and gives numerous examples for individual metres. In addition to Piṅgala, Agnipurāṇa (chapters 328-334) also deals with prosody in considerably condensed memorial verses. Strangely enough, a chapter (104) of an astrological work, named Bṛhatsaṁhitā of Varāhamihira (6th century A.D.), also deals with prosody. Here metres have been associated with planets, and many of the verses convey two different meanings in such a way that they define metres and describe the movements of planets at the same time. Bhaṭṭotpala in his commentary, by way of explanation, has referred to a metrical text, of which

1. For example, *la*=*laghu*, i.e., "light or short syllable; *ga*=*guru*, i.e., "heavy or long syllable"; *ma* for — — —; *ya* for ∪— — ; *ra* for — ∪— etc.

2. Prākṛta Piṅgala-Sūtras (text with commentary) published in Km. 41, 1894. Cf. Weber, Ind. Stud. 8, 202 f.; Pischel, Prākrit Sprachen (Grundriss) p. 30f, Keith, Catalogue of Prākrit MSS. in Bodl. c. 48. According to Jacobi (Bhavisattakaha of Dhaṇavāla, p. 5*) the Prākṛta Piṅgala belongs to the 14th century A.D. at the earliest.

3. According to Jacobi, Ind. Stud. 17, 442 ff., Chandoviciti, that is no more available, a work of Daṇḍin, had become a standard work for poets. P.V. Kane (Ind. Ant. 40, 1911, 177f.) has pointed out that by Chandoviciti (Kāvyādarśa I, 12) we should understand "prosody" in general and not the title of a work, and that neither Daṇḍin nor Vāmana had written a work on prosody. But it must not be taken to mean that when rhetoricians prescribe the study of prosody for poets they directly mean the work of Piṅgala, as assumed by Kane. A Prākṛta-Piṅgalasūtra was published in the Bibl. Ind. 1902, too. Ratnaśekhara's Chandaḥkośa, a pendant to Prākṛta-Piṅgalasūtra has been dealt with by W. Schubring ZDMG 75, 1921, p. 97ff.

the author is mentioned by him simply as "teacher" (ācāryā). Here each metre is defined by means of a stanza composed in the same metre.

Kedārabhaṭṭa's Vṛttaratnākara "Ocean of Metres"[1], is a work on prosody that has had a very wide circulation. This book deals with only non-Vedic metres and in fact describes their 136 types. The work is much quoted, and the large number of commentaries on it, both in print and in MSS. existing in India, prove that it has been very popular here.

Another work, much quoted, is the Śrutabodha of Kālidāsa[2]. But its authorship is now and then ascribed by scholars to Vararuci too. There are many extant commentaries written on it. The verses defining the metres serve also as their examples at the same time.

Kṣemendra too has written a work on prosody, the Suvṛttatilaka[3], that is divided into three sections. Section one contains a description of the metres, for each of which the writer has provided as example a stanza composed by himself. Section two is on faults and merits of prosody; but here the quoted examples are not only from the writings of the author himself but also from elsewhere. We obtain many useful data for a history of literature from section three, which is devoted to reputed poets of the past and their special fascination for one or the other of the metres[4].

Of the other works on prosody, Chandonuśāsana[5] of Hemacandra, Vāṇibhūṣaṇa of Dāmodara[6] and

1. Published with a commentary in Bombay, NSP 1908. An English translation of this work appeared in the Pandit, Vol. IX, 45 f., 91ff., 140 ff. Kedārabhaṭṭa was the son of Pavyeka or Pabbeka. According to Krishnamacharya (167) he must have written the Vṛttaratnākara in the beginning of the 15th century. Since he is very often cited by Mallinātha, who lived in the 15th century, he must have been somewhat older.

2. Cf. Colebrooke, Misc. Ess. II, 65; H. Ewald in the Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Moregenlandes, Bonn 1842, IV, 57ff; Aufrecht, CC. I, 675; Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. II, 1082 ff. H. Brockhaus has published it in his book "Über den Druck sanskritischer Werke mit lateinischen Buchstaben" (Leipzig, 1841). It has been printed several times in India, also in Haeberlin 9-14.

3. Published in Km., Part II, 1886, 29-54.

4. So, for example, Pāṇini liked Upajāti, Bhāravi, the Vaṁśastha, Bhavabhūti, the Śikhariṇī, Kālidāsa, the Mandākrāntā, etc. On the use of metres in Indian poets see also Kühnau, ZDMG. 44 1890, p. 1ff.

5. Bühler, Hemacandra, p. 33, 82.

6. Published in Km. 53, 1895, Cf. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. II, p. 301ff.

Chandomañjarī of Gaṅgādāsa[1] may be referred to briefly.

BEGINNINGS OF ORNATE POETRY

As already suggested, we are to see the first stage of Indian poetry in the Mahābhārata and, more particularly, in the Rāmāyaṇa. Whatever, in our opinion, may be the amount of alterations and additions made by later authors in them, it cannot be denied that the first traces of the kāvya style are to be found in these two epics, in their earliest parts, that go back to a date before Christ. Nevertheless, so far as the poetic materials used are concerned, the difference between the epics, such as the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa, on the one hand, and the poetical works of writers like Kālidāsa and Amaru, on the other, is so great that in any case we are obliged to admit a lapse of a big interval of time between these two types of poetry. Apparently, court ornate poetry did not on the whole originate in the soil of the epics; it did so in that of the lyrics. Evolution of prosody no doubt shows that the first poetic metre must have developed in love-ballads[2]. Here, when the theme of the song admitted of little alteration, the poet was obliged to attract the attention of his audience and to win their admiration through external form and through artificiality of metre and of language. Like erotics, panegyrics did not offer a less important stimulus for artificial form. When the poets extolled in their songs glories of the princes, in whose courts they lived, their poems, being expressive of high admiration for the patrons, all along were full of artifices. Consequently, it was just natural that the court poets vied among themselves, surpassed one another, and finally one who knew how to introduce into his poems the largest number of "embellishments" was considered to be the greatest of them. This kāvya style in due course found its way into the epics through the panegyrics.

History of court poetry would go back at least as far as the 4th century B.C., when lived the great grammarian and poet Pāṇini, to whom is ascribed also the authorship of two epics, namely Pātālavijaya and Jāmbavatī-

1. Cf. Brockhaus in the BSGW 6, 1854, 209-242; Eggeling loc. cit. II, Nr. 1099 ff.

2. Cf. Jacobi, ZDMG 38, 615ff. and above p. 32.

v i j a y a, as well as of not a few verses, quoted in anthologies[1]. None of the two epics has come down to us, and consequently it is not certain whether the P ā t ā l a v i j a y a and the J ā m b a v a t ī v i j a y a are two different works or just two titles of one and the same work. R ā j a ś e k h a r a in the following verse says:—

namaḥ pāṇinaye tasmai yasmād āvirabhūdiha l
ādau vyākaraṇaṁ kāvyam anu jāmbavatīvijayam ll

"Hail to Pāṇini, who by the grace of Rudra, first wrote the grammar and then the poem Jāmbavatīvijaya"[2]. Whether this Rājaśekhara is the poet, to whom a large number of verses are ascribed in anthologies or the dramatist Rājaśekhara (end of the 9th and beginning of the 10th century) or a different Rājaśekhara—in any case, he belongs to too late a period and is too unreliable a testimony for establishing the identity of the grammarian, who wrote his grammar towards the close of the Vedic period, with a poet, whose language is hardly different from that of Kālidāsa. But it is of great significance to note that in one of the stanzas quoted by Namisādhu (in a commentary written in 1068 A.D. on Rudraṭa's Kāvyālaṅkāra) from Pāṇini's Pātālavijaya there are horrible solecisms, unlikely from the pen of the grammarian[3]. The verses ascribed to Pāṇini exhibit, however, no mean artistic merit:

tanvaṅgīnāṁ stanau dṛṣṭvā śiraḥ kampayate yuvā l
tayorantarasaṁlagnaṁ dṛṣṭim utpāṭayanniva ll

"The youth, having seen the two breasts of beautiful

1. P. P e t e r s o n (JBRAS 17, 1889, 57ff; Subh. 54ff.) has particularly set himself to the task of identification of this poet with the grammarian. Before him already P i s c h e l (ZDMG 39, 1885, 95ff., Gram. der Prākrit Sprachen, p.33) proposed to place the grammarian in the 5th century A.D., an impossible dating, upon which he himself did not insist later (KG. 182f.). See against this K i e l h o r n, NGGW 1885, 185 ff., R.G. B h a n d a r k a r, JBRAS 16, 344; D. R. B h a n d a r k a r, Ind. Ant. 1912, 125 n. Recently K a n e (Ind. Ant. 1912, 125) has again tried to prove the identity. T h o m a s, Kavīndrasamuccaya 51ff. (where is given a collection of the verses of Pāṇini) holds the question as still undecided. Th. A u f r e c h t (ZDMG 14, 581 f., 27, 46; 36, 365 ff.; 45,308) has collected together and translated the stanzas ascribed to Pāṇini. Rāyamukuṭa, in a commentary written in 1431 A.D. on the Amarakoṣa (ascribed to him) has quoted a piece of a poem from Jāmbavatīvijaya. The poet Pāṇini has been cited by Ruyyaka too.

2. Since this verse occurs in Subhāṣitamuktāvalī, written by Jalhaṇa in 1247 A.D., this Rājaśekhara cannot be the Jaina writer, who lived in the 14th century; but he may be either the dramatist or yet another third.

[3. The ungrammatical horrors mentioned by K e i t h (HSL, p. 204) are : *apaśyati*, *gṛhya*, narrative aorists, etc.]

women, shakes his head, as if he were extricating his gaze fast stuck 'twixt them."

kṣapāḥ kṣāmīkṛtya prasabham apahṛtyāmbu saritāṁ
pratāpyorvīṁ kṛtsnāṁ tarugahanamucchoṣya sakalaṁ l
kva saṁpratyuṣṇāṁśurgata iti tadanveṣaṇaparās-
taḍiddīpālokā diśi diśi carantīva jaladāḥ ll

"Having made the nights short, having perforce dried up the water of the streams, having parched all earth and scorched every thicket, where has the sun gone to', so saying the clouds are stalking hither and thither, as if holding lightning for a lamp".

The existence in the 2nd century A. D. of secular lyrics composed in artistic metres and in the style of the ornate court poetry is attested to by Patañjali, the second great grammarian, in whose Mahābhāṣya we find a number of citations from ornate poetry[1]. In anthologies Patañjali too is here and there referred as the author of a number of stray stanzas[2]. Piṅgala's time was really not far away from that of Patañjali[3]. His manual of prosody would also prove the existence of an erotic ornate poetry in the 2nd century.

We have nothing of the ornate court poetry written in Sanskrit between the 2nd centuries B.C. and A.C. It seems that during this period Prākrit poetry was cultivated in the courts of princes. Remnants of this class of poetry have been preserved in the Sattasaī of Hāla and in the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya, (which unfortunately is not preserved in its original version).

1. Cf. Bühler, Die indischen Inschriften und das Alter der indischen Kunstpoesie p., 72. and Kielhorn, Ind. Ant. 14, 326f. H. Lüders (Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen, p. 62) believes in the existence of the kāvya style already in the Hāthigumphā Inscription of Khāravela, written in the 2nd century A. D. (according to Smith, Early History, p. 207 in 218 A.D.). But this Prākrit inscription is preserved in such a mutilated form that we can understand little about its style and language. On the inscription, cf. Lüders, Ep. Ind. X, App. p. 160f and Charpentier, WZKM 29, 1915, 208 ff.). Recent researches on the Hāthigumphā inscription by R.D. Banerji and K.P. Jayaswal in JBRAS 1917, 425ff; R.C. Majumdar and K. G. Sankara Aiyar, Ind. Ant. 47, 1918, 223f.; 48, 1919, 187 ff; 49, 1920, 43ff. According to V. A. Smith (JRAS 1918, 543) ff. the date of this inscription is estimated at 170 B. C. See also Ramā Prasāda Chanda, Smith and F. W. Thomas, JRAS, 1919, 395ff.; 1912, 83 f.; Ind. Ant. 48, 1919, 214 ff.

2. Cf. Peterson, JRAS 1891, 311 ff.

3. See above p. 31.

Also in the T h e r ī g ā t h ā s, belonging to the Buddhist canons, we find songs and verses that show the style of ornate poetry[1]. Besides, in Prākrit there is an inscription of Nāsik, written in the 19th year of the reign of King Pulumāyi of the Andhra dynasty (154 A.D.)[2] showing all the characteristics of the style of ornate prose.

Of the same period is the great Sanskrit inscription of Mahākṣatrapa R u d r a d ā m a n, that is a formal poem in prose[3]. Long compounds and long sentences, like those required by Daṇḍin for prose composition, as well as the various embellishments are all through found in this inscription. The style is what has been designated by Daṇḍin as the "Vaidarbha" style. The fact that already in the 2nd century A.D. the style of ornate poetry was taken over to prose too and was used in inscriptions as well probably proves that it had developed much earlier.

Of the 2ndcentury A. D. we have the epics and the dramas of the Buddhist poet A ś v a g h o ṣ a[4], that in language and style

1. See above II, 84f., trans. p. 106. It was long believed that in the first century A.D. there came into existence a formal literary style in course of development in Sanskrit literature, and that in the 6th century A.D. took place a "renaissance of Sanskrit literature" for the first time (see Max M ü l l e r, India, What it can teach us, London 1882, Indien in seiner weltgeschichtlichen Bedeutung, Leipzig, 1884). This theory in particular has been fully developed by G. B ü h l e r in Die indischen Inschriften und das Alter der indischen Kunstpoesie (SWA 1890). Cf. also H a r a p r a s ā d Ś ā s t r i in the JASB 6, 1910, 305ff. R.G. B h a n d a r k a r (A Peep into the Early History of India, JBRAS 1900, p. 407 f., Reprint p. 52 f.) in fact does not believe in a complete cessation of Sanskrit literature, but in its irregular development during the centuries of Buddhism and Prākrit literature from the 1st century B.C. to the 4th century A.D. It does not appear correct to speak about a "Prākrit period" of Indian literature, as has been done by F. L a c ô t e, Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā, Paris 1908, like J a c o b i Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī, p. XIff.), to have preceded the classical period. Prākrit poetry is the composition of certain class of people, apparently of several courts, certainly belonging to different sects, but our study has not revealed any particular period of which we possess an Indian literature in which Prākrit alone, and not Sanskrit as well, happened to be the literary medium.

2. Cf. B ü h l e r, Die indischen Inschriften etc. p. 56ff., and S m i t h, Early History, p. 210.

3. The inscription has been published by K i e l h o r n, Ep. Ind. 8, 36 ff. and is regarded by him as of 151 or 152 A.D. B ü h l e r (loc. cit. p. 49) places it between 160 and 170 A.D. The inscription is found also on a rock near Girnār. Rudradāman belonged to the so-called "western Kṣatrapas". Kṣatrapa is a Sanskrit adaptation of Persian Khshathrapa (Greek "Satrap", as the land-lords and chieftains of the Indo-Scythian kings were designated, who ruled over the whole of north-west and west India in the first two centuries A.C.

4. See above II, p. 201 ff., transl. p. 256ff.

belong to the ornate court poetry. The finished form of the epics together the perfect technique of the dramas of Aśvaghoṣa proves that they were composed only on some long-standing models. By itself it appears improbable that a thoroughly Buddhist poet should be the first to have composed in this style. On the contrary, the possibility is that he adopted the earlier poetic style to Buddhist themes for the simple reason that this style was common for secular poetry in his times. Aśvaghoṣa, however, was not the solitary Buddhist poet. Mātṛceṭa and Āryaśūra must have been not very far away from him in time[1].

It would be of importance for the history of ornate poetry if we could be able to determine precisely the antiquity of the alaṁkāraśāstra (science of rhetorics) and its relation to the kāvya style. But, unfortunately, it has to be admitted that we are neither able to fix the time of Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra nor do we know anything about the age of probably the oldest manual on poetics of Bhāmaha with some certainty. Yet, we have hardly any reason to think that poetics developed from a source other than the study of some model poetical pieces of the Mahābhārata or more particularly of the Rāmāyaṇa. Vālmīki certainly did not yet know about a manual of poetics; but, Aśvaghoṣa was perhaps familiar with the theory of the alaṁkāras[2]. Further development of poetry took place no doubt under the influence of alaṁkāraśāstra. Bhāsa and Kālidāsa definitely knew the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata[3].

In general we have been accustomed to regard a work of poetry that is older as less refined and less influenced by the theory. But this conclusion is correct only in a limited sense. It would be more correct to say that when a poet writes in a simple style, it is said that either he belongs to an older period or that he has a superior taste. There have been

1. See above II, p. 201ff. trans. p. 269ff. The language of Śūra has been praised in one of the stanzas of the anthology Saduktikarṇāmṛta; see Aufrecht, ZDMG 36, 365; Peterson, Subh. 131. Other Buddhist and Jaina texts in the kāvya style belong to later centuries, so also the Divyāvadāna (see above II, 222, 225), trans. pp. 284, 288, Candragomin's poems and other Buddhist stotras (see above II, 259, 267, trans. p. 365, 380). For Pāli works like Mahāvaṁśa and Jinālaṁkāra (see above II, 170, 179 trans. pp. 211, 223, and for stotras of Bhadrabāhu and others (see above II, 339, trans p. 549).

2. Cf. Kane, Ind. Ant. 1912, p. 127.

3. On the relationship of Kālidāsa to Nāṭyaśāstra, cf. A. Hillebrandt, Kālidāsa, p. 107ff.

poets, even in later days who had sufficient taste to avoid a very high flown kāvya style[1]. Besides, we learn from Daṇḍin's poetics that there arose great l o c a l differences in respect of the style[2]. In eastern India, in the courts of mighty kings, poetry seems to have been cultivated earlier than in the south-west. For the first time in the 4th and 5th centuries A.D., when the Guptas attained sovereignty, the poet of the west too entered into the field of poetic competition[3].

Naturally, the development of court poetry on the whole essentially depended upon the courts in which poetry found special encouragement, and the question is not always of antiquity of time, but often also of place and circumstances.

It is probable that court poets and ornate court poetry already existed during the reign of the Maurya dynasty. It is yet doubtful as to how far the A r t h a ś ā s t r a of K a u ṭ i l y a reflects the condition of the court of the Maurya King Candragupta. The tradition ascribing the authorship of this work to the wise minister of Candragupta agrees little with the facts of history. In any case, the work goes back to a considerably high antiquity, and it is probable that its earliest elements reach upto the Maurya period. And it is noteworthy that among the large number of court employees are mentioned also paurāṇikas, sūtas, māgadhas, kuśīlavas ; (i.e. chroniclers, bards, singers and dramatists), but there is not a word about the court poet. The teacher and the taught (ācāryāḥ vidyāvantaś ca) who got an honorarium of 500 to 1000 paṇas[4], according to merit, were probably only prominent Brāhmaṇas, whom the king wanted to honour and not perhaps the poets who would have been called "kavi". Among the names of literary works referred to in Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra there is no mention of kāvya anywhere. This accords also with the fact that the inscriptions of Aśoka are written in a plain and simple style and do not bear

1. R. G. B h a n d a r k a r, JBRAS 16, 266. In spite of the high regard for finer poetry, Indians themselves have always considered the simple epics the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa as model works.

2. See above, p. 15.

3. Cf. J a c o b i, Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī, p. XVI f.

4. Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, ed. by R. S h a m a S a s t r i, Mysore, 1909, p. 245f.

any trace of the ornate style. It is near about this time that the rise of the poetical form is often suggested.

To the 3rd or 4th century A.D. probably belongs Tanträkhyāyikā, the oldest form of the Pañcatantra. The dramas of Bhāsa too must have originated in the 4th century A.D. With some compromise we can characterise the poems of Aśvaghoṣa and those of his contemporaries, Hāla's Sattasaī (in its oldest constituent), Guṇāḍhya's Bṛhatkathā, Tantrākhyāyikā and the dramas of Bhāsa (in the form they are) as belonging to the classical or early classical period of Indian ornate poetry.

We can just guess that this classical poetry blossomed in the courts of the later Āndhra rulers, the western Kṣatrapas and the Kuṣaṇa princes and their contemporaries. We are not in a position to determine with certainty the date of any of the works of this period.

Summing up, therefore, we can only say that the inscriptional as also the literary testimony in fact enables us to place the continuity of ornate court poetry upto the 2nd century A.D., its existence in the 2nd century B.C. and the beginnings of its golden age in the 4th century A.D.

THE GOLDEN AGE OF ORNATE COURT POETRY

The ornate court poetry attained its golden age and its highest peak first during the period of the reign of the rulers of the Gupta dynasty. This dynasty was founded by Candragupta I in 320 A. D. He was succeeded by his son Samudragupta (about 330 or 335 A.D.), who distinguished himself with attainments in wars which have been described in a panegyric poem (praśasti) of his court poet, Hariṣeṇa by name, inscribed on a stone pillar at Allahabad. The inscription which to all appearance belongs to 345 A.D. contains 9 stanzas and a concluding verse in high-styled prose, and the praśasti designates itself expressly as a kāvya. The empire ruled over by Samudragupta comprised of the richest and the most fertile regions of northern India, and was of enormous size such as had not been seen ever since the days

1. See above, p. 38, note 3. and cf Bhagvānlāl Indrajī, JRAS 1890, 639ff; Lévi, JA. p. 9, tome XIX, 1902, 95ff.

of Aśoka. The court poet praises not only the military adventures of the king, but also his poetic and musical faculties. We, in fact, are in possession of gold coins presenting him as playing on a harp. Hariṣeṇa asserts that the epithet "prince-poet", borne by Samudragupta, was well merited "on account of his authorship of many poems worthy of imitation". Lastly he says that the king rejoiced in the company of writers and learned men and participated in the study of the holy scriptures[1].

When this king whose influence extended from the Oxus to beyond Ceylon died in about 375 A.D., he was succeeded by his son Candragupta II, who assumed the title of Vikramāditya, i.e., "the sun of heroism". The name Vikramāditya is a highly renowned one in Indian stories and literary traditions. Since many of the Indian rulers assumed this title, it is very difficult to determine as to which king is meant by them by the Vikramāditya of the stories. We have, however, good grounds in support of Candragupta II's having the strongest claim for being considered identical with the traditional king "Vikrama", since he too is so designated for short[2]. Like his father, Candragupta II made great acquisitions for his kingdom and like him had a literary taste. On one coin he is mentioned as bearing the epithet rūpakṛtī (author of dramas)[3]. He ruled for nearly forty years. The Chinese pilgrim Fahien, who visited India between 405 and 411 A.D., reports that in his kingdom there was great prosperity and that hospitals and other charitable institutions for the welfare of the people flourished.

1. Cf. Bühler, Die indischen Inschriften, etc. p. 31ff.; Fleet, Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum III), Calcutta 1888, p. 1ff. ; Smith, Early History, 281ff, 288f., and JRAS 1897, 19ff.; A. Gawronski in Festschrift Windisch, p. 170ff.

2. Cf. Hoernle, JASB, Proceed. August 1891; Barth, Rev. Crit. 1892, p. 190 n. In case Candragupta II is the Vikramāditya of the tradition, the stanza that does occur under Vikramāditya in anthologies may have originated from him (see Peterson, Subh. 117.f.; Thomas, 105f.) But that is nowise certain.

3. Cf. Smith, Early History, p. 290. On the literary and poetic advancement under the Guptas, ibid p. 303ff. R.G. Bhandarkar, (Peep into the Early History of India), JBRAS 20, 1900, 439f., Reprint, p. 43f.) reminds us of the fact that the epithet "enemy of Śakas" (Śakāri) of Vikramāditya fits Candragupta II well, for he conquered Mālwā in early 4th century A.D. and expelled the Kṣatrapas from Mālwā and Kuṣāṇas from Mathurā. His capital was at Ujjayinī, the city of the Vikramāditya of the tradition.

When Candragupta II died in 413 A.D., he was succeeded by his son, K u m a r ā g u p t a I, who reigned for more than forty years. A large number of inscriptions and coins of his times prove that his empire was nowise smaller than that of his predecessor. He practised as a poet, bore the title "poet-prince" and was a patron of poets besides. According to one of his inscriptions he was the person "who brought the traditional conflict between fine poetry and wealth to an end". Towards the close of his reign the Huns, who from the central Asian steppes had penetrated into the north-western passes, flooded the whole of northern India with their first invasion. He was succeeded in 455 A.D. by his son S k a n d a g u p t a, who too likewise assumed the title of Vikramāditya. Soon after he ascended the throne, he succeeded in defeating the Huns in a decisive battle. This victory is glorified in a pillar edict (at Bhitarī in the Ghāzīpur district, situated to the east of Vārāṇasī) that is still preserved for us. But towards 465-470 A.D. the second invasion of the Huns again made the country restless, and this time Skandagupta could no more protect himself against them. They overflooded the kingdom of Gāndhāra and appear to have made the Gupta empire very weak. So, when Skandagupta died in about 480 A.D., the glory of the Guptas came to an end. Probably the dynasty still continued for a few generations more, but these later Guptas had little prestige. Under the leadership of Toramāṇa, the Huns subdued the Gupta empire in about 500 A.D. and established their government at Mālwā in central India. In about 510 A.D. Toramāṇa was succeeded by his son Mihiragula. Under these two chieftains the Huns became the virtual rulers of India. Mihiragula's reign is said to be very oppressive and tyrannical, and it is easy to imagine the extent to which those barbarians were hated by the Brāhmaṇical Hindus. In about 528 A.D. B ā l ā d i t y a, king of Magadha, and Y a ś o d h a r m a n, a rājā of central India entered into an alliance against Mihiragula, and the two together succeeded in rescuing the country from the oppressing foreigners. While the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-Tsiang ascribes the glory of defeating the Huns to Bālāditya, Yaśodharaman praises himself in the inscriptions preserved on two of his pillars of victory, saying that he made his own the empire that the Guptas and the Huns could

not retain. His reign, however, seems to have been short and of no significance, as claimed in these inscriptions.

It was necessary to include here this short history of the Gupta dynasty, because the golden age of ornate court poetry undoubtedly falls during the period of the reign of the Guptas. The inscriptions of the Gupta kings, whose age extends approximately from 350 to 550 A.D., contain panegyrics (praśastis) of different kings of the dynasty, that are more or less full-fledged poems composed in the kāvya style. It is certain that in those days, as these inscriptions prove, not only poets participated in competitions, but even princes vied with their court poets. Above all, to this age belongs Kālidāsa, the greatest poet of classical Sanskrit literature[1].

It is significant that on account of uncertainty that prevails in the literary history of India, Indians do not know how to frame things like tales on the life of their most eminent poet[2], and that the opinions of Indian as well as of western scholars still differ by centuries in spite of the fact that much, too much, has been written on the subject[3].

There is a legend that Kālidāsa was in fact born as the son of a Brāhmaṇa, lost his parents early and was brought up by a cowherd. A vulgar and uncultured herdsman, he was married to a princess who felt ashamed of him—till he made himself a very wise and learned scholar through the grace of Kālī, attained through assiduous devotion and practice.

---

1. In the anthology Harihārāvalī occurs the following anonymous verse:

> *purā kavīnāṁ gaṇanāprasaṅge kaniṣṭhikādhiṣṭhitakālidāsā* ।
> *adyāpi tattulyakaverabhāvād anāmikā sārthavatī babhūva* ॥

"Long ago, it is said, counting poets, they began with the little finger for Kālidāsa; even to this day the finger beside it is still called 'anāmikā', nameless, for since then none has been born to occupy a place beside Kālidāsa".

Kṛṣṇabhaṭṭa, quoted in the same anthology (and also in Sārṅgadhara-paddhati, p. 4), says: "Poets were Kālidāsa and others, we too are poets: the same substance is found both in the mountain as well as in the atom." Hari Chand, Kālidāsa et l'art poetique, p. 119ff. shows the extent to which Kālidāsa has been considered to be the model poet by rhetoricians.

2. Winternitz says in the addenda that A. Hillebrandt's important work "Kālidāsa", Breslau 1921 appeared after greater portion of this volume had already been printed.

3. The different views on the age of Kālidāsa have been collectively described by G. Huth, Die Zeit des Kālidāsa, Diss., Berlin 1890 and by B. Liebich, Indogerm. Forschungen 31, 1912-13, p. 198ff.

Consequently, he was named Kāli-dāsa "servant of Kālī"[1]. Another tradition, that is current particularly in Ceylon, makes Kālidāsa a contemporary of the Ceylonese prince and poet Kumāradāsa, who lived in the 6th century A.D[2]. In the large number of anecdotes connected with Kālidāsa, narrated in later works like Bhojaprabandha and orally retold by the paṇḍitas the name of Kālidāsa serves the story-tellers, as Hoernle says, simply "as a hook on which to hang their tales"[3]. These stories do not have any historical value at all.

We are able to gather from the works of Kālidāsa himself that he was a Brāhmaṇa, a devotee of the highest being (paramātman) in the form of God Śiva and an adherent of the Vedānta Philosophy[4]. He was well familiar with the scenes of the Himālayas[5]. The charming description of the city of Ujjayinī in the poem Meghadūta leaves perhaps no doubt that this was his native land. The title of his drama Vikramorvaśīyam contains an allusion to Vikramāditya[6] and this would, therefore, hint at the fact that he lived and composed his poems in the court of a king, who bore the title Vikramāditya. The legends that make Kālidāsa a court poet of Vikramāditya are

1. The story is narrated in many versions; see Tārānātha's History of Buddhism, translated by A. Schiefner, p. 76 ff; R. Vāsudeva Tullu, Ind. Ant. 7, 1878, 115ff; M. Narasimhiengar Ind. Ant. 39, 1910, 236.

2. T.W. Rhys Davids and C. Bendall, JRAS. 1888 and 148f. and 440; W. Geiger, Literatur und Sprache der Singhalesen (Grundriss 1, 10) p. 3f.; Huth, loc. cit. p. 51ff; H. M. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, JASB 62, 1893, 212ff; I. E. Seneviratne, The life of Kālidāsa, Colombo 1901. The Life of Kālidāsa in Ceylon has been dramatised too.

3. Cf. Grierson and Hoernle, JRAS 1906, 692 f.; 699 f. The anecdotes on Kālidāsa in Ballāla's Bhojaprabandha, see in Th. Pavie, JA. p. 5; tome IV, 1854, 385-431; S.M. Natesa Sastri, Ind. Ant. 18, 40ff. Tales, as the paṇḍitas of Ujjain narrate even today, in Jackson, JAOS 22, 1901, 331 f.

4. Cf. Ch. Harris, An Investigation on some of Kālidāsa's Views, Evansille, Indiana 1884; M.T. Narasimhiengar, Kālidāsa's Religion and Philosophy, Ind. Ant. 39, 1910, 236 ff., Krishnamacharya 73f.

5. Cf. Bhāu Dāji in Nandargikar's Introduction to his edition of Raghuvaṁśa p. 35f.

6. According to Shankar P. Pandit (Raghuvaṁśa—edition) Preface, p. 31 ff). the title directly means "the drama of Urvaśī, dedicated to or written under the patronage of Vikrama". But once the title has been correctly explained as "the drama of Urvaśī, found through heroism", it would not be impossible to interpret it as an allusion to King Vikrama, i.e., Vikramāditya, as also intended.

in accord with it; particularly the legend according to which Kālidāsa was one of the nine jewels living in the court of the legendary king of Ujjayinī. In one of the verses, which is still current, it is said that there lived in the court of the king Vikrama nine jewels, learned men and poets—Dhanvantari, Kṣapaṇaka, Amarasiṁha, Śaṅku, Vetālabhaṭṭa, Ghaṭakarpara, Kālidāsa, Varāhamihira and Vararuci. However, firstly this verse occurs in a work that is of a very late date and is little trust-worthy[1]. Further, Varāhamihira, the astronomer, evidently lived in the first half of the 6th century A.D., when no king of this name is known to have borne the title of Vikramāditya. Besides, Kālidāsa was older than Varāhamihira from the point of his style and astronomical ideas. Likewise Dhanvantari, the writer of a medical glossary, is older than Amarasiṁha, who evidently has utilized Kālidāsa in his dictionary[2]. The age of the lexicographer Kṣapaṇaka, the poet Ghaṭakarpara and the grammarian Vararuci is not settled, whilst the names Vetālabhaṭṭa and Śaṅku are otherwise little known. On the whole it is striking that of the names of the nine jewels only Kālidāsa, Amarasiṁha, Varāhamihira and Vararuci are in fact famous. It seems that the only object of this verse is to extol the fame of some Vikramāditya, and for this poets and scholars of different ages have been wrongly mentioned together as living under his rule. This ostensible tradition, which has often been criticised, therefore, proves nothing. It may just mean that Kālidāsa lived in the court of a king, who called himself Vikramāditya.

Now, we know that the Gupta princes Candragupta II and Skandagupta are seen bearing the epithet Vikramāditya in their coins. We have also seen that the earlier Gupta rulers

1. In this work the authorship of Jyotirvidābharaṇa, a book on astrology, which must have been written in the 16th century A.D., is wrongly ascribed to Kālidāsa. See A. Weber, ZDMG 22, 1868, 708ff. A mention of the nine-jewels is claimed to have already been found in an inscription discovered from Buddhagayā. However, the inscription is now lost and is known only from a very doubtful copy of Wilmot and from its translation by Ch. Wilkins (As. Res. 1, 1806, 284ff.). Wilmot seems to have been a victim of forgery. Cf. A. Holtzmann, Über den griechischen Ursprung des indischen Tierkreises, Karlsruhe, 1841, p. 18f., 27ff; Bühler, loc. cit. p. 78f; Zachariae, Die indischen Wörterbucher, p. 18f; Fleet, Int. Ant. 39, 1901, 3f.

2. Jacobi, ZDMG 30, 1876, 304f.

3. Zachariae, loc. cit p. 6 and Beiträge zur indischen Lexikographie (Berlin 1883), p. 37.

have had poetic, literary and scientific inclinations. In addition, certain other conditions also present themselves making it probable that Candragupta II was the Vikramāditya under whom Kālidāsa lived. His capital was at Ujjayinī, with which we are already acquainted as the native land of Kālidāsa. It is not wrong to assume, therefore, that in the epic Raghuvaṁśa diverse references to Candragupta II have been made[1]. In the same epic Kālidāsa calls the poet of the Rāmāyaṇa a mythical sage of a former age, who lived in another yuga, i.e. in a distant period of human history. Wherefrom it follows that between Vālmīki and Kālidāsa centuries must have elapsed. Further it was long ago proved by J a c o b i[2] that certain astrological statements that occur in the epics of Kālidāsa disclose his knowledge of Greek astrology and that the material from Greek astrology, as found in the works of Indian astrologers, reached India in the middle of the 4th century A.D. through Firmicus Maternus. B ü h l e r has shown how Vatsabhaṭṭi, the author of an inscription dated 473 A.D., found in a temple of the sun at Mandasor, otherwise an absolutely insignificant versifier, made it his business to vie with the great poet, imitating not only his style, but also taking many verses from Kālidāsa for modelling his own thereafter. If this be correct, it must be admitted that Kālidāsa, already in 473 A. D., had become an eminent poet. Consequently the age of Kālidāsa is limited approximately between 350 and 472 A.D, the reign of Candragupta II extending circa 375-413 A.D[3].

There are some scholars, who have come forward with

1. T. B l o c h, ZDMG 62, 1908, 671ff. The objections against Bloch raised by F.W. T h o m a s, JRAS 1909, 740ff., do not appear sound. However, it can never be strictly proved whether or not the poet had actually meant the respective allusions. That Kālidāsa lived during the time of Candragupta II has been admitted also by B h a n d a r k a r (Peep into the Early History of India, JBRAS 1900, 440 f., Reprint 44f); A.B. K e i t h, (JRAS 1909, 433ff.), P i s c h e l (KG 201) and R a p s o n (ERE IV, 885).

2. Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften 1873, p. 554ff. and ZDMG 30, 1876, 302ff.

[3. S. K. De., HSL. p. 125 is of the opinion "......it would not be altogether unjustifiable to place him roughly at 400 A. D. It is not unimportant to know that Kālidāsa shared the glorious and varied living and learning of a great time ; but he might not have done this, and yet be the foremost poet of Sanskrit Literature. That he had wide acquaintance with the life and scences of many parts of India, but had a partiality for Ujjayinī, may be granted; but it would perhaps be hazardous, and even unnecessary to connect him with any geographical setting or historical environment".]

the statement that Kālidāsa lived under Kumāragupta towards the end of the 5th century A.D[1]. And since we know nothing at all about the life of Kālidāsa, and little about his age in spite of everything, it is p o s s i b l e that he might have begun his literary activity sometime during the reign of Candragupta II, continuing it during period of the reigns of Kumāragupta and Skandagupta[2]. He would then have lived approximately from 390 to 460 A.D. However, it too is equally possible that he lived earlier (approximately from 350 to 420 A.D.). So, all that we know as c e r t a i n is just that the fame of Kālidāsa was well established in the first half of the 7th century A.D., when he was praised highly by the famous author Bāṇa and also in an inscription dated 634 A.D. he is mentioned as a famous poet[3]. For these reasons, the opinion[4], that had general currency earlier and is still entertained by some researchers that Kālidāsa lived sometime in the 6th century A.D. does not seem at all probable.

The age of Kālidāsa is controversial and there is no unanimity even as to the works that are ascribed to him. The number of works ascribed to o n e Kālidāsa is very large, but they are

1. Ibid. p. 18 ff., 24f. Cf. K i e l h o r n, NGGW 1890, 251ff.

2. These scholars (Monmohun C h a k r a v a r t i, JRAS 1903, 183ff.; 1904, 158ff.; B. C. M a z u m d a r, JRAS 1909, 731ff. ; B. L i e b i c h, Indogerman. Forschungen 31, 200), depend mainly upon the description of Raghu's victory-march (*digvijaya*) in the 4th canto of Raghuvaṁśa. B ü h l e r (Die indischen Inschriften etc. p. 82) has already warned against any far-fetched decision on the basis of these stereotyped descriptions. (Cf. also K.B. P a t h a k, Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 265 ff.). The latest researches of A. G a w r o n s k i (The Digvijaya of Raghu and some connected problems in Roznik Oryentalistyczny, Polnisches Archiv für Orientalistik, Krakau 1914-1915) too prove that Kālidāsa came to the court of Kumāragupta and became the famous court poet under Skandagupta but these are not convincing.

3. So E. W i n d i s c h, Geschichte der Sanskrit Philologie (Grundriss, 1, 1 B), p. 175, note 2.

4. On this inscription from the Megaṭi-temple of Aihole, cf F l e e t, Ind. Ant. 8, 1879, 237ff., and K i e l h o r n, Ep. Ind. 6, 1-12. K i e l h o r n (Ind. Ant. 20, 1891, p. 190) has shown that it is probable that the authors of the praśastis in the inscriptions of the 6th century A. D and also that of another inscription of Kambodia of the early 7th century A.D. were familiar with the Raghuvaṁśa.

5. A.F.R. H o e r n l e (JRAS 1909, 89 ff.; Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 156) has particularly set up an amusing hypothetical structure with the intention to prove that Yaśodharman, who defeated the Huns or had contributed to their defeat (see above, p. 43), was the Vikramāditya of the tradition, under whom lived Kālidāsa although Yaśodharman is seen nowhere to have assumed the title of Virkramāditya.

certainly not the output of the great poet[1]. Indisputably belonging to the poet are the epics Kumārasaṁbhava and Raghuvaṁśa, the dramas Śakuntalā and Vikramorvaśīya and the lyric Meghadūta and most probably also the drama Mālavikāgnimitra and perhaps the garland of songs Ṛtusaṁhāra too.

As in the case of Kālidāsa, so also in the case of most other poets of fame, their age can hardly be determined with certainty. Truly speaking we can directly say : the more famous the name of a poet in Indian literature, the more uncertain his date. There have been many poets, who were once famous, but we know nothing at all about them except their names. Thus for example, Kālidāsa has mentioned the name of the famous poet Saumilla by the side of Bhāsa among his predecessors; and in anthologies Rāmila too is mentioned, in addition to Saumilla (or Somila), beside Bhāsa. A work entitled Śūdrakakathā, (probably a novel, that deals with the story of king Śūdraka), that we do not now possess, is ascribed to both these poets[1]. Naturally we do not know whether both of them were senior contemporaries of Kālidāsa or if along with Bhāsa they too are to be assigned to the pre-classical period.

During the time of Vikramāditya, if the word refers to Candragupta II, also contemporaneously with Kālidāsa, must have been Mātṛgupta ruling in Kashmir. This Mātṛgupta was himself a great poet and a patron of the great epic poet Meṇṭha

1. A list of the works that go under the name of Kālidāsa has been given by M. Sashagiri Sāstri in the Ind. Ant. I, 1872, 340 ff. Cf. Aufrecht, CC I, 99. The stanzas that are ascribed to Kālidāsa in anthologies have been collected together by Th Aufrecht, ZDMG 39, 1885, 306 ff.; cf. Thomas 30 ff. The question of the date of Kālidāsa as well as that of the authorship of the works ascribed to him is consequently rendered more difficult by the fact that many poets of later times assumed the name "modern Kālidāsa" (Navakālidāsa, Abhinavakālidāsa, see Aufrecht, CC I, 24, 280). Among the paṇḍitas the opinion current is that there have been three Kālidāsas, of whom one is believed to have lived under Vikramāditya, another under Bhoja and the third under Emperor Akbar (Cf. Weber, ZDMG 22, 713; 27, 175 f., 182; Peterson, Subh. 18 ff). The compiler of Harihārāvalī calls himself Akbarīya Kālidāsa (see Krishnamacharya 126). [Yudhiṣṭhira Mimāṁsaka, Saṁskṛta Vyākaraṇa kā itihāsa Part I p. 26, depends on Rājakavivarṇana 24, 26 when he states that the real name of the author of Raghuvaṁśa was Hariṣeṇa, who too came to be known as Kālidāsa.]

2. Cf. Konow in Festschrift Kuhn 106f.; Peterson, Subh. 103f.

(or Bhartṛmeṇṭha, also called Hastipaka)[1]. A later Kashmirian poet compares the style of Meṇṭha with that of Subandhu, Bāṇa and Bhāravi[2]. Rājaśekhara says that Vālmīki himself appeared on the earth in the form of Meṇṭha : and Kalhaṇa reports that Mātṛgupta was so much impressed with Meṇṭha's Hayagrīvavadha (no more available) that he placed a golden key under it, so that the brilliance of the book might not fade.

About Amaru, the most famous Indian lyric poet, we can only guess that in matter of time he may not be regarded as long separated from Kālidāsa. The dates of the dramatists Śūdraka and Viśākhadatta are quite indefinite. We can hardly say anything about the famous epic poets Bhaṭṭi and Bhāravi or about Bhartṛhari, the most distinguished gnomic poet, except that each of them had already become famous before 650 A.D.[3].

With Varāhamihira, the astronomer and poet, we come to a definite date for the first time. He died in 587 A.D. In the second half of the 6th century, there ruled in Kashmir the King Pravarasena II[4], the poet or patron of the author of the Prākṛt epic Setubandha. About the talented story-teller and master of literary prose Daṇḍin[5], as about

1. Rājataraṅgiṇī 3, 125 ff., 260ff. Verses of Mātṛgupta have been cited by Kalhaṇa (Rājatar. 3, 181), in Kṣemendra's Aucityalāṁkāra (Peterson, JBRAS 16, 169; 176) and in anthologies. On his commentary on the Nāṭyaśāstra see above p. 10. People have wrongly tried to identify Mātṛgupta with Kālidāsa. Verses of Meṇṭha are preserved in anthologies. Cf. Aufrecht, ZDMG 27, 51; 36, 368; Peterson, Subh. 92 ff., 117 f.; Bühler, Report 42; Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī, trans. I, p. 83f.

2. Maṅkha in Śrīkaṇṭhacarita 2, 53; [see S. K. De HSL, p 322.]

3. Bhaṭṭi says towards the end of his epic that he lived under Srīdharasena of Valabhī. But there have been four rulers of this name, who ruled between 495 and 641 A.D. We are not in a position to determine as to which of them is meant by Bhaṭṭi. Cf. Duff, p. 308, and Hultzsch, ZDMG 72, 1918, 145ff. Bhāravi is mentioned in the Aihole Inscription (see above p. 48, note 2) as a famous poet. Bhartṛhari has been mentioned by I-tsing in about 650 A.D. [Cf. also Yudhiṣṭhira Mīmāṁsaka, SVI, p. 258.]

4. Cf. M.A. Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī, trans. Vol. I, pp. 66, 84f.

5. See above, p. 13, note 1. According to a verse quoted in anthologies there were three well-known works of Daṇḍin (see Aufrecht, ZDMG 27, 34). We know, however, only the work on poetics, the Kāvyādarśa and the novel Daśakumāracarita. K. B. Pathak, JBRAS 20, 1898, 39) concludes from Kāvyād. 3, 114 that Daṇḍin had written it before 608 A.D. On the contrary, R. Narasimhachar (Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 90ff.), though he would like to identify Rājavarman, mentioned in Kāvyād. 2, 279 with Rājasiṁhavarman and the latter again with Narasiṁhavarman II of Kāñcī, concludes that Daṇḍin lived at the end of the 7th century A.D. According to Hari Chand, Kālidāsa, p. 80f. he knew the work of Bāṇa and should be placed in the first half of the 7th century A.D.

the second great prose writer Subandhu[1], we can just guess that they belonged to the beginning of the 7th century A.D.

We enter for the first time into strictly firm historical region with the dramatist and king Harṣadeva or Harṣavardhana[2] of Thānesar and Kanauj, who ruled from 606 to 647 A.D. We know much more about his life and work than about those of any other ruler of India, on the evidence not only of inscriptions and coins, but also of the historical romance Harṣacarita, in which Bāṇa has described the life of his patron and friend, and again nowise less definitely than the account of the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang, who travelled in India between 630 and 644 A.D., lived for a sufficiently long time in the court of Harṣadeva and received much honour from the king[3]. We learn from his inscriptions that he did possess high literary inclinations and that he was not only a patron of poets and writers, but was himself a poet[4]. Consequently we have no ground to disbelieve the Indian tradition and the Chinese chronicles that remember him as the author of many dramas and of Buddhist hymns. After a thirty-seven years' reign of bloody and successful wars, he devoted the rest of his life to peaceful government of his great kingdom, that extended over almost the whole of northern India, promoting and encouraging literature and science, establishing monasteries and charitable institutions and doing

1. Subandhu has been referred to by Bāṇa, and hence he could not be of an age, later than the 7th century A.D. According to Telang (JBRAS 18, 1891, 147ff.) he lived at the end of the 6th and in the beginning of the 7th century A.D., a point supported also by the great similarity of his style with that of Bāṇa. Haraprasād Śāstrī (JASB 1, 1905, 253 ff) would, on the basis of an ingenious but perhaps risky hypothesis, like to place him in the beginning of the 5th century A.D. From verse No. 10 of Vāsavadattā, where Subandhu complains that with the death of Vikramāditya poetry fell into decay, it might be concluded that Subandhu wrote in a period when Vikramāditya had already become a traditional patron of poets, and probably that nearly 150 years after the death of Chandragupta II Vikramāditya he was alive. Cf. D. R. Bhandarkar, Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, p. 1. For a different opinion Hoernle, JRAS 1909, 138 ff., and Gray, Vāsavadattā, Introd. p. 8 ff.

2. For short commonly called Harṣa or Śrīharṣa too. He bore the epithet Śilāditya "sun of virtue". Bāṇa (Harṣacarita, introductory verses 18f.) calls him also Āḍhyarāja (rich king); see Pischel, NGGW 1901, part 4; Thomas JRAS 1903, 830.

3. On Harṣadeva, see Smith, Early History, pp. 335-356.

4. Bühler, Ep. Ind. 1, 71 (An Inscription dated 632 A.D.). I-tsing (trans. by Takakusu, p. 163) too mentions that Śilāditya was a lover of literature.

his best for the good administration of his empire. Towards the end of his life he manifested a strong inclination for Buddhism, which he, particularly under the influence of Chinese scholar Hiuen-Tsang, came to patronize more and more. During the age of Harṣadeva Buddhism, of course, spread yet further in northern India, although Brāhmaṇical and purāṇic cults flourished beside it among the masses. It is noteworthy that the grand'father of the king was a devout worshipper of Śiva, his father, an equally devout worshipper of the sun, and his elder brother and his sister, followers of Buddhism, while he himself showed equal devotion to Śiva, the sun and the Buddha through construction of temples and sanctuaries[1]. This attitude of Harṣādeva towards different religious currents of his time, as we have already seen, has found expression also in his poems. He appears to have lived as a poet composing Buddhist hymns towards the last days of his life.

To Harṣadeva's circle belongs also the lyrist M a y ū r a, who according to an uncertain tradition was probably the father-in-law or brother-in-law of the famous court poet B ā ṇ a[2].

M ā g h a, the author of Śiśupālavadha, must have lived, in the second half of the 7th century A.D., since his grand'-father Suprabhadeva was the first minister of a king Varmalāta, (mentioned in an inscription of the year 625 A. D.)[3]. His

1. Hiuen-Tsang reports also about a great conference held at Prayāga, in which were discussed the statues of Buddha on the first day, those of the sun-god on the second day and Śiva's on the third day. On the fourth day alms were distributed by the king among 20,000 Buddhist monks; but on the following day the Brāhmaṇas and holy men of other sects were likewise honoured with costly presents. On Harṣadeva as a writer of Buddhist hymns see Appendix to II, 267, transl. p. 377.

2. G.P. Q u a c k e n b o s has made a detailed study about Mayūra in "The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra, edited with Translation, Notes and an Introduction etc." New York 1917 (CUIS 9).

3. Cf. F. K i e l h o r n, NGGW 1906, 143ff; JRAS 1908, 499ff. Śrīmāla is situated close to Mount Ābū, which, according to the inscription, belonged to the empire of Varmalāta. D. R B h a n d a r k a r (Ep. Ind. 9, 187 ff) seeks to prove that Māgha lived sometime in the beginning of the 8th century A.D. as a contemporary of Jinendrabuddhi. K l a t t (WZKM 4, 1890, 61ff.) regards Māgha, on the basis of the anecdote narrated in the Jaina Prabhāvakacarita (see above II, 335, transl. p. 519), a contemporary of the poet Siddha (906 A.D.). But J a c o b i (WZKM 4, 236ff.) has shown that Māgha was certainly quoted and imitated in the 9th century A.D. The anecdote is just one of the many examples showing how the Jainas draw all famous men into their stories. [On Māgha, see also D.C. Bhattachārya, Ind. Ant. 46, 1917, and 191 f. The lower terminus to the date of Māgha is furnished by the quotation from his poem by Vamana and Ānandavardhana.]

homeland was Śrīmāla in Gujarat. According to the statements of the poet himself and anecdotes recorded by the Jainas[1] he was a son of a wealthy man and lived independently on his own.

The first ruler of Kanauja, about whom we hear after the death of Harṣadeva (647 A.D.), is Yaśovarman, who sent an envoy to China in the year 731 A.D., and nine or ten years later was deprived of his throne by Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa of Kashmir[2]. He was a patron of letters, and is himself known as the writer of a drama Rāmābhyudaya, and verses are ascribed to him in anthologies[3]. In his court lived the famous dramatist Bhavabhūti and the Prākrit poet Vākpatirāja of the famous Gaüḍavaha, a disciple of Bhavabhūti according to his own admission[4]. Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa, the dramatist could not have been much younger, as he is already cited by Vāmana.[5]

With Bhavabhūti the golden age or the classical period of Indian poetry may be considered to have come to an end.

The Most Important Poets of the Later Centuries

Rājānaka Ratnākara, the writer of Haravijaya, Vakroktipañcāśikā and a large number of verses ascribed to him in anthologies, lived under the Kashmirian kings

1. The anecdote, narrated in Merutuṅga's Prabandhacintāmaṇi (trans. by Tawney, p. 48ff.) and in Ballāla's Bhojaprabandha. that makes him a contemporary of king Bhoja, is however, unhistorical like many other anecdotes narrated in such works.

2. Cf. Smith, Early History, 378.

3. Peterson, Subh. 95f; Thomas 75f.

4. Rājataraṅgiṇī 4, 144; Gaüḍavaha 799; cf. Shankar P. Pand t, Gaudavaha, Introd. p LXIV. According to Subhāṣitāvali, he was a son of Harṣadeva, and, according to Yaśastilaka, he was thrown into prison by Yaśovarman and there he composed the poem; see Peterson, Subh. 115.

5. Veṇīsaṁhāra 5, 152 cited in Kāvyālaṁkāravṛtti 4, 3, 28. According to tradition Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyana was one of the Kanauj Brāhmana's invited to come to Bengal by Ādiśūra, thus perpetuating a Kulīna-Brāhmaṇas strain in that region. With this accords well the statement that Bhaṭṭa Nārāyana lived in the 8th century A.D. [Cf. S.M. Tagore, Veṇīsamhāra Nāṭaka, preface and Krishanamacharya 95, 161. Konow, Das indische Drama, p. 77, does not come to a definite conclusion regarding the age of Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa, but believes that there is nothing that might stand against the hypothesis that he lived in the second half of the seventh century, A D.]

Cippaṭajayāpīḍa (826-838 A.D.) and Avantivarman (855-883 A.D.)[1].

At the end of the 9th century and the beginning of the 10th century A.D., under the patronage of Mahendrapāla and Mahīpāla of Kanauj, there lived the dramatist Rājaśekhara[2], who calls himself the teacher of Mahendrapāla and a contemporary of Kṛṣṇaśaṅkaravarman. Verses of Rājaśekhara are frequently quoted in anthologies of which a large number written on different poets is particularly important for history of literature, and these stanzas have perhaps been taken from a work on poetics ascribed to him[3].

In the 11th century A.D., the city of Dhārā in Mālava played a great rôle in literature. Here ruled King Muñja (974-995 A.D.)[4], who was a great patron of poets, a lover of literature, and a poet himself. He was succeeded by his younger brother Sindhurāja Navasāhasāṅka. We know Padmagupta, the author of Navasāhasāṅkacarita, as the court poet of both. Much more famous as a lover of poets is Bhoja (1018-1060[5] A. D.)', nephew of Muñja. There

---

1. His verses have been translated by Aufrecht, ZDMG 36, 372ff Cf. Peterson, Subh. 96ff; Jacobi WZKM 2, 212ff.; 5, 25 ff.; Rājataraṅgiṇī 5, 34; V S. Apte, Rājaśekhara, His Life and Writings, Poona 1886, p. 16f.; Bühler, Report 42ff. and Stein Rājataraṅgiṇī, Trans. Vol. I, p. 95f.

2. Cf. Fleet, Ind. Ant. 16, 175ff.; Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. 1, 1889, 171; Bhaṭṭanāthasvāmin (Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 143) places him between 884 and 959 A.D. From an inscription we learn that he was a distinguished poet of the 11th century A D., see Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. 1, 1,253f. According to Hultzsch (Ind. Ant. 34, 1905, 177ff.) Rājaśekhara was not a Brāhmaṇa, but a Kṣatriya and the teacher of Mahendrapāla only in fine arts. Mahendrapāla ruled from 899 to 907 A.D, see D.R. Bhandarkar, Ep. Ind. 9, 27. V. S Apte, loc. cit. deals in detail about Rājaśekhara; Sten Konow, Karpūramañjarī ed., p. 173ff.; Thomas, 80ff. Rājaśekhara has been quoted in the commentary on Daśarūpa, in the Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa of Bhoja, by Ruyyaka, Kṣemendra and Abhinavagupta and in the Yaśastilaka of Somadeva.

3. See, however, above, p. 36, note 2. A collection of these verses is found in the introduction to the printed edition of Karpūramañjarī in Km. 4. Cf. Peterson, Subh. 101; Karpūramañjarī ed. p. 196f.; Zachariae GGA 1887, p. 89 A.

4. Vākpati II, Utpalarāja Amoghavarṣa, Pṛthvīvallabha and Śrīvallabha too were his names. Cf. Smith, Early History 395. Perhaps many of the verses ascribed to "Vākpati" in anthologies belong to this king; see Thomas 103.

5. So also Smith, Early History, 395f. Cf. Bühler, Ep. Ind. 1, 222ff. Vikramāṅkadevacarita, Introd. p. 23, and Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī Transl., Note on 7, 190-193. The inscriptions of Bhoja are dated 1019 and 1021; see D.R. Bhandarkar, Ind. Ant. 1912, 201. For a list of works ascribed to him see Aufrecht, CC I, 418; II, 95.

are a number of tales and anecdotes told about his love for literature and his generosity towards poets and learned men, very like the tales about Vikramāditya. There are many scholarly works (on poetics, medicine etc.) and poems that are ascribed to him[1]. Many of his stanzas are included in anthologies. It is remarkable that we do not till now know of any important poet by name to have in fact lived in his court.

In the 11th and 12th centuries Kashmir became a prominent seat of literature and science. In about 1070-1090 A.D. here lived the poet B i l h a ṇ a, son of Jyeṣṭhakalaśa, who won equal fame as a writer of lyrical, epic and dramatic poems. He left Kashmir during the reign of Kalaśa (1064-1088 A.D.), probably in 1065, visited different courts in India, and finally became a court poet of King Vikramāditya VI of the western Cālukya dynasty, for whom he wrote the Vikramāṅkadevacarita[2] at a time when Harṣa of Kashmir was still a prince (between 1081 and 1089 A.D.).

In Kashmir there lived also the prolific writer K ṣ e m e n d r a[3], who has enriched almost all branches of literature. He wrote epics and dramas, abridged the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa, rendered the Kādambarī and Bṛhatkathā into verses, composed religious poems and didactic stanzas, wrote works on poetics, prosody and politics, and did not spare even obscene topics. Some of his books are dated 1037, 1050, 1052 and 1066. In his earlier years he was an ardent devotee of Śiva, but later got converted to Vaiṣṇavism and followed the dictates of the Bhāgavata with ardour. Although he was not a Buddhist, yet he had a heart, large enough, to adopt Buddhist legends for his subjects.

A little junior to Kṣemendra, between 1063 and

1. Cf. A u f r e c h t, ZDMG 27, 67ff., T h o m a s 63ff.

2. Cf. Rājatar. 7, 938; P e t e r s o n, Subh. 66ff. P i s c h e l KG 208; D u f f 128; B ü h l e r, Vikramāṅkadevacarita, Introd. p. 20ff.; and F l e e t, Ind. Ant. 20, 1ff. 93f., 266ff., 280f. (on the Chronology of Cālukyas).

3. On him, cf. B ü h l e r, Report 45 ff.; P e t e r s o n, Report 1882-1883, p. 46f.; JBRAS, Vol. 16, Extra number p. 4ff.; Subh. 26ff., L è v i, JA 1885, s. 8, vol. VI, 397 ff., and S t e i n Rājataraṅgiṇī Trans. II, p. 375f. Two epics Muktāvalī and Lāvaṇyavatī, the drama Citrabhārata and a chronicle Rājāvalī (severely criticised for untrustworthiness by Kalhaṇa Rājatar. 1, 13) are no more available.

1081 A.D., Somadeva[1], the master story-teller wrote his famous Kathāsaritsāgara "The Ocean of Streams of Stories". Then came the poet Maṅkha, under King Jayasiṁha (1128-1149 A.D.) of Kashmir, who wrote an epic Śrīkaṇṭhacarita[2]. Again, about 1148 A.D. Kalhaṇa, the greatest, nay, the only great historian that India has produced, wrote his famous chronicle of Kashmir—the Rājataraṅgiṇī.

The court of King Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal[3], who came to the throne in 1119 A.D., too developed into a centre of poetry and learning. In his court lived Umāpatidhara[4], Dhoī[5], Govardhana, and above all Jaydeva, the most famous poet of the Gītagovinda-fame.

In the court of Kings Vijayacandra and Jayacandra of Kanauj, in the second half of the 12th century A.D., there lived probably Śrīharṣa, the author of Naiṣadhacarita[6].

Here only the most prominent names have been enumerated. It will be shown, however, in the chapters, following, dealing with the different classes of poetry, that beside these numerous others continued writing even later than the 12th

1. Somadeva wrote his work for the purpose of diverting the mind of Queen Sūryamatī, who burnt herself with her husband Ananta, who committed suicide in 1081 A.D; see Bühler, Ueber das Zeitalter des kaśmirischen Dichters Somadeva, Wien 1885 (SWA).

2. Bühler, Report 50ff.

3. Cf. R. Pischel, Die Hofdichter des Lakṣmaṇasena (AGGW 39, 1893 and M. Chakravarti, JASB N. S. 2, 1906, 157ff. [According to D. D. Bhattacharya, Lakṣmanasena was born in 1119 A.D. and reigned approximately from 1170 to 1200 A.D.]

4. Umāpati or Umāpatidhara wrote one Candracūḍacarita, that is no more available. Numerous verses composed by him are found in anthologies; see Aufrecht, ZDMG, 40. 1886, 142f. Probably he is also the author of a poetical inscription of Vijayasena, the grand'father of Lakṣmaṇasena; see Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. 1, 305ff.

5. Dhoī (or Dhoyī or Dhoyīka, with the title Kavirāja) has been treated by M. Chakravarti, JASB, N.S. 2, 1906, 15ff.

6. That the name of the poet is Śrīharṣa and not Harṣa is proved by the fact that in the colophons to the cantos of Naiṣadhacarita he calls himself "Śrīharṣa". At the same place he gives the names of his father and mother as Hīra and Māmalladevī and enumerates the titles of many of his written works, of which the philosophical Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khādya alone is extant. Bühler (JBRAS 10, 1871, 31ff., 1874, 279ff.) on the basis of statements in Rājaśekhara's Prabandhakośa has determined his age. K.T. Telang (Ind. Ant. 2, 71 ff.; 3, 81ff.) and Rāma Prasāda Chanda (Ind. Ant. 42, 1913, 83 f., 286f.) doubt its credibility and like to place the poet in 9th or 10th century A.D. Cf. D. R. Bhandarkar, ibid p. 83 n; Peterson, Subh. 136f. and Krishnamacharya 44ff.

century, right down to the modern times, with more or less recognition.

The Ornate Court Epic

The ornate court epic of the classical and post-classical periods derives its materials mostly from tales about old gods and heroes, as they are narrated in the two popular epics and in the purāṇas. Thus, for example, K ā l i d ā s a in his epic Raghuvaṁśa retells the story of Rāma, whilst for the plot of his Kumārasaṁbhava he depends on the purāṇic myths[1].

Of these two epics in all probability K u m ā r a-s a ṁ b h a v a[2], "The Birth of Kumāra", is older. Kumāra is the name of the war-god Skanda, who, according to mythology, was procreated by Lord Śiva for the purpose of commandeering gods in their war against the demons. Cantos I-VIII however just describe how Umā, the daughter of the Himālaya (hence commonly called Pārvatī "daughter of the mountain"), won the affection of the terribly stern ascetic god Śiva, practising severe penance, merely through sheer power of her youthful beauty and succeeded in getting him as her husband.

At Indra's behest Kāma, the god of love, tries to disturb Śiva in his severe penance. In co-operation of his friend Vasanta (the spring season) and his consort Rati (lust) he starts on his errand in right earnest. Not only men and gods, but even animals and plants are stirred under the powerful awakening of the spring. (III, 39) :

paryāptapuṣpastavakastanābhyaḥ sphuratpravāloṣṭhamanoharābhyaḥ ।

1. On the critical problems regarding both these epics of Kālidāsa see J a c o b i in OC V, Berlin 1881 II, 2 p. 133ff.

2. Cantos I-VII translated into Latin and published by A. F. S t e n z l e r, London 1838. English translation of the same cantos by R. T. H. G r i f f i t h (The Birth of the War-God, a Poem by Kālidāsa, 2nd Ed. London 1879). German translation of the Cantos I-VIII in prose by O. W a l t e r, München—Leipzig 1913. Cantos VIII-XVII were published for the first time in the Pandit, Vol. I, 1866. In the same journal was discussed in detail the question of genuineness of these cantos by Indian scholars. (Cf. also W e b e r, ZDMG 27, 174ff. and Indian refutation) 3, 217 ff. 241ff. There are nice editions of all the 17 cantos with commentaries in NSP, 4th Ed., Bombay 1906; cantos I-VIII, the commentaries of Aruṇagiri and Narāyaṇa G a ṇ p a t i Ś ā s t r ī in TSS, Vol. 27, 32, 36, 1913-14. Following the translation of G r i f f i t h in March 1912, was presented in the Court Theatre in London the story of Kumārasaṁbhava in 18 tableaux by Indian ladies and children (As. Quart. Rev N S. 1,1913, p.327).

latāvadhūbhyastaravopyavāpurvinamraśākhābhujabandhanāni ।।

"Even the trees enjoyed deep embrace
From lovely creepers, their spouses,
Their breasts, the exhuberant clusters of anxious blossoms,
With lips of sprouts,
And with twigs for arms".

But, at the sight of the ascetic Śiva the immovable, absorbed in deep meditation, sitting on a hide of a tiger, dressed in the skin of a black antelope, his head encircled by snakes, a rosary suspended from his ears, his motionless eyes extending upto the nose—"like a cloud, not affected by rains, like a lake without an inkling of a wave, like a lamp unstirred by the wind" (III,44-48) ;-Kāma becomes doubtful of success. And then—there appears Umā in her full majesty and bloom shows her reverence to Śiva. At this opportune moment the god of love darts his arrows at Him. But the latter restrains the awakening love, passing catches sight of Kāma and burns him with the flame of the third eye in his fore-head. Umā returns home in despair. Canto fourth describes the pathetic wails of Rati over the ashes of her burnt husband[1]. Umā, now dresses herself in barks and takes to a harder course of asceticism. Her penance and pious devotion at last touch the heart of Śiva. There flow solicitations. Their marriage is like that of human beings. Śiva invites the seven sages (Saptarṣi) and Arundhatī and shows her the same respect as to the holy sages : distinction goes[2] not to sex, but to character. VI, 12 :

tāmagauravabhedena munīṁścāpaśyad īśvaraḥ ।
strīpumānityanāsthaiṣā vṛttaṃ hi mahitaṃ satām ।।

"With equal devotion gazed the Lord
At her, as also at the holy men,
Whether a female or male, to the great, that is the same[2],
Since the fact is : it is only the conduct that is honoured".

The sight of Arundhatī, the examplar of woman's faithfulness to her husband, strengthens Śiva's desire for his sweet'heart.

1. Translated into German by Rückert; see Ruckert-Nachlese II 478ff.

2. A rare expression in an Indian home !

At length he begs of them to ask of the Mountain for Pārvatī's hand for him, which they willingly do. The ṛṣis go accompanied by Arundhatī, as "generally in such affairs women have the aptitude (*prāyeṇaivaṁvidhe kārye puraṁdhrīṇāṁ pragalbhatā*—VI, 32)". During the marriage, that is described in the canto seven, are performed a series of rites and ceremonies, observed as even at a human wedding. And, when the bridegroom enters into the capital of the mountain king, people rush to the windows to take a view of the Lord of Lords and of the couple[1].

Then in the eighth canto follows the description of amorous flings of the just married couple that discloses an accurate knowledge of Kāmaśāstra. The thoughtful fervour, the splendour of images and the choice of expression do make us feel that we are enjoying here a genuine composition of Kālidāsa. The poet describes how Śiva's spouse is at first bashful and seems hesitant in surrendering herself completely to the will of her sweet'heart. VIII, 14 :

sasvaje priyamuronipīḍanaṁ prārthitaṁ mukham anena nāharat ।
mekhalāpraṇayalolatāṁ gataṁ hastamasya śithilaṁ rurodha sā ॥

"And now she embraced her sweet'heart,
Pressing him hard with her lovely breasts,
Her face, however, she did not offer to him in response,
Though cajoled hard ;
Slowly she checked his hand,
Slowly and slowly moving, enticed to her girdle".

One day Śiva, lying indolently on a stone-slab in the hill-side forest, just as the sun is setting in the west, leaning over the breasts of his darling, describes the beauty of the sundown and of the approaching night in such picturesque figures, as we are accustomed to expect in Kālidāsa alone. VIII, 45:

raktapītakapiśāḥ payomucāṁ koṭayaḥ kuṭilakeśi bhāntyamūḥ
drakṣyasi tvamiti saṁdhyayānayā vartikābhiriva sādhumaṇḍitāḥ ॥

1. The poet has borrowed here (VII, 56-69) from Aśvaghoṣa, the description of the scene in Buddhacarita III, 13-24 (see above II, 205, trans. p.261); the picture of the lotus-faces of women, gazing down looking like real lotuses set into balconies (Buddhacarita III, 19) is taken in its entirety into the Kumāras. (VII, 62). For the rest, however, in the matter of presentation of details Kālidāsa is independent. The fact that the scene is taken over into Raghuvaṁśa (VII, 5-16) word for word shows that it had a particular fascination for the poet.

"Red, yellow and brown,
There yonder shine the crests of clouds,
Now the dusk is making them appear in their best,
Touching them to a finish,
Wishing my curly Love,
Just glanced that way."

Kālidāsa alone could see the evening glow whelmed by the dark looking like a stream of liquidified red mineral under tamāla shades standing on its banks.

tāmimāṁ timiravṛddhipīḍitāṁ ।
śailarājatanayedhunāsthitām ।
ekatastaṭatamālamālinīṃ
paśya dhāturasanimnagāmiva ॥

Other Kālidāsan pictures on view are when the west, with its declining evening glow appearing like a red stripe is compared to a field of battle touched off by a besmeared bow (VIII, 54)[1], and, again, when the moon dispels darkness as if his beloved, the night, were flicking back her hairs : further again, when Śiva kisses her face and in rapture she closes her eyes like lilies of the night (VIII, 63). Canto eight closes

1. The stanzas referred to here read and are translated as follows:

sāndhyamastamitaśeṣamātapaṁ
raktalekhamaparā vibharti dik ।
sāṁparāyavasudhā saśoṇitaṁ
maṇḍalāgramiva tiryaguñjhitaṁ ॥

"The west is upholding the red line of the still remaining diminishing glow of the evening, like the warfield, the crooked sword, that is besmeared with blood and has been discarded".

aṅgulībhiriva keśasañcayaṁ
saṁnigṛhya timiraṁ marīcibhiḥ ।
kuḍmalīkṛtasarojalocanaṁ
cumbatīva rajanīmukhaṁ śaśī ॥

"The moon (looks), as if kissing the face of the night, that has its lotus-eyes closed, having caught hold of the darkness with his rays, like the lock of hair with his fingers".

samdivasaniśīthaṁ saṅginastatra śambhoḥ
śatamagamadṛtūnāṁ sārdhamekā niśeva ।
na tu suratasukhebhyaśchinnatṛṣṇo babhūva
jvalana iva samudrāntargatastajjalaughaiḥ ॥

"There passed 150 seasons of Śambhu, who had his union equally during the day and night, but his lust for amorous enjoyment did not diminish, like fire that is inside the ocean, with heaps of water".

wit a verse letting us know that although he had enjoyed 150 seasons in amorous sports, Śiva's time passed like a single night, his craving for love, undimmed like submarine fire, never extinguished even by ocean's fathomless waters[1].

Perhaps some stanzas or probably one canto in which the birth of Kumāra was described briefly and discreetly has been lost. In that case Kālidāsa would have hardly developed the purāṇic myth of the war-god's birth, a most unsuitable theme for poetic representation, as some later hand has done in the certainly spurious cantos IX-XVII. These cantos, not only on account of their contents but also on account of their language, can easily be seen as an interpolation[2].

1. The genuineness of canto VIII has been wrongly questioned by scholars. That it is wanting in many of the manuscripts (and consequently also in the first printed edition) is due to the fact that on religious, and not perhaps moral, grounds people have been hesitant to regard as genuine the highly profane description of the enjoyments of the divine couple. Rhetoricians have been divided in opinion as to whether it is proper to describe this scene from the life of great gods. Ānandavardhana (Dhvanyāloka, III, 6, p. 137, Jacobi's translation, offprint p. 78f.) thinks that it is definitely from the pen of the poet and he even refers to that accordingly. The relevant portion of the Dhvanyāloka reads : "*mahākavīnām apyuttamadevatāviṣayaprasiddhasambhogaśṛṅgāranibandhanād anaucityaṁ śaktitiraskṛtaṁ grāmyatvena na pratibhāsate yathā kumārasambhave devīsambhogavarṇanam*". "Even master poets have delineated passion among gods and yet impropriety does not strike one as vulgar, because the impropriety has been camouflaged by the poet's genius. The description of Pārvatī's amours in the Kumārasaṁbhava is an explicit instance". A different opinion is expressed by Mammaṭa (Kāvyaprakāśa VII) who says that it is outright improper for the poet to describe the amours of one's elders. Vāmana cites from this canto at two places in his poetics (4, 3, 33 and 5, 2, 25). The passage in Kāvyaprakāśa reads:—

"*ratisaṁbhogaśṛṅgārarūpā uttamadevatāviṣayā na varṇanīyā, tadvarṇanaṁ pitroḥ saṁbhogavarṇanamiva ātyantamanucitam*" :

it has been translated by Gaṅgā Nātha Jhā as follows: "Love in the shape of erotic enjoyment is not to be described with regard to the best Divine—this description being as improper as the erotic delineation of the company of one's own parents."

2. Since Mallinātha too wrote a commentary on cantos I-VIII as of Kālidāsa, what seems plausible is that the rest was added sometime after him. Even Aruṇagirinātha (See G a ṇ a p a t i : TSS 37, Preface), who came earlier, has commented upon only these 8 cantos. The great conformity between the Kumārasaṁbhava and the Śivarahasya of the Śaṅkarasaṁhitā of the Skandapurāṇa is to be explained through the assumption that the writer of the Śivarahasya had utilized Kumāras, cantos I-VIII, as a means for this mischief. Cf. W e b e r, ZDMG 27, 179, 190 ff. and Pandit. Vol, III, 19ff., Ind. Streifen, III, p. 217f.; 211 f.; [S. P. B h a t t ā c h a r y a, Proceeds of the Fifth Or. Con. Vol. I, pp. 43-44; S. K. D e. HSL. pp. 126.] In the 14th century A.D. the Jaina J a y a ś e k h a r a wrote yet another epic Kumārasaṁbhava (see P e t e r s o n, 3 Rep. Extr. 251ff.). Udbhaṭa too had written one Kumarasaṁbhava (see above p. 19.)

Another great epic of Kālidāsa is the Raghuvaṁśa[1], "The History of the Family of Raghu", in which the poet describes the life and achievements of Rāma and also those of his predecessors and successors. The first nine cantos are devoted to the four immediate predecessors of Rāma, Dilīpa, Raghu, Aja and Daśaratha; then in cantos X-XVI he describes, fairly in agreement with the Rāmāyaṇa, the career of Rāma. Kālidāsa does not conceal the fact that he found his inspirations in the great epic of Vālmīki[2]. However, he does not let himself off into a competition with the ādikavī. He has narrated the actual Rāma-tale very briefly, so briefly that the cantos of the Raghuvaṁśa devoted to this theme are just a neat abridgement of the seven books of the Rāmāyaṇa. On the other hand, his genius has an entire range providing new opportunities for originality, particularly in the cantos devoted to Raghu and Aja.

Almost all the heroes of the solar race whose carreers and achievements have been sung by Kālidāsa are weal as kings. All of them devote, as said in I. 8, their childhood to the study of sciences, strive for worldly success in youth and in old age, like pious hermits, resort to sylvan life for the purpose of meditation. As rulers they extend the boundaries of their empire and administer a noble and honest government for the welfare of their subjects. They are of strictly Brāhmaṇical faith and solemnly observe all the religious ceremonies of the states, holding the arch-priest in the highest esteem. Such an ideal king among them is Dilīpa, grand'son of Vivasvān, about whom Kālidāsa says (I, 18) :—

prajānāmeva bhūtyarthaṃ sa tābhyo balim agrahīt |
sahasraguṇam utsraṣṭum ādatte hi rasaṃ raviḥ ||

1. Text with Latin translation published by A. F. Stenzler, London, 1832. Of the Indian editions those of Shankar P. Pandit in BSS, 1869-1874, G.R. Nandargikar (3rd ed., Bombay 1897) with Mallinātha's commentary, numerous explanatory notes and complete English translation in prose deserve a mention. Ad. Fr. Graf von Schack, Orient und Occident III, Stuttgart 1890, has indeed given a beautiful, abridged and free German metrical rendering. E. Leumann gives a metrical translation of the first 31 stanzas in Festschrift Windisch, p. 43 ff. and O. Walter, München-Leipzig 1914, gives a complete translation in German prose.

2. To Kālidāsa Vālmīki is a sage of former times, a contemporary of his hero Rāma and ādikavi "or the first of poets" (XI, 41).

"For their welfare alone
He realized the taxes from his people,
Even as the sun draws up water
To return hundred times to the earth."

Subsequently when Dilīpa retires into the forest, his son Raghu succeeds to the kingship. His famous campaign for victory over the world (*digvijaya*) is described in detail. All the enemies bow down before him, so that he is able to perform at the end a Viśvajit (all-subduing) sacrifice. He is succeeded by his son Aja, in whose career the poet evinces greater personal interest. He marries Indumatī, the princess of Bhoja. The ceremony of "self choice of husband" (svayaṁvara) is described vividly. It is an elegant festive assembly that we see. After the bards have recited the genealogies of the princes, present, Indumatī appears in her nuptial rôle. She attracts the heart of everybody ; each one hopes for the best. Led by the concierge she emerges directly into the circle of the waiting princes. But none of them pleases her, and

sañcāriṇī dīpaśikheva rātrau yaṁ yaṁ vyatīyāya patiṁvarā sā ।
narendramārgāṭṭa iva prapede vivarṇabhāvaṁ sa sa bhūmipālaḥ ॥

"Desirous of selecting her husband,
Whomsoever she passed by,
Turned colourless, like watch-tower on the king's highway,
At the approach of a glimmering lamp,
At night"[1].

But the moment she comes near Aja, her heart throbs and after a show of maidenly bashfulness she throws the garland about his neck, thus selecting him for her husband. After her marriage, however, the rejected princes leave behind their presents and withdraw with a cheerful face, concealing their feeling of disappointment "like clear lakes, sheltering crocodiles in their depths" (VII, 30). On the way home Aja is attacked by these disgruntled princes and there ensues a bloody battle, the description whereof offers the poet an occasion for many splendid similes. To him the

1. The comparison contained in this verse (VI, 67) of Indumatī with the glimmer of a lamp (dīpaśikhā) has pleased the Indian poets so much so that they remember the poet, on account of this simile, as the "Dīpaśikhā-Kālidāsa" (see Peterson, OC VI; Leiden 1883, III, 2, 339 ff.),

battle field appears like Death's drinking stall, where the heads of the slain enemies are the fruits, their dropped helmets, the drinking cups and the stream of blood flowing from them, the liquor (VI, 40). Then the poet depicts in beautiful verses the ideal administration of Aja after his coronation, and his happy family-life, that is blessed with the birth of a son, Daśaratha. One day while the king is walking with his wife in the park, suddenly a garland of heavenly flowers falls from nowhere on the breasts of the queen and she drops dead. The pathetic bewailing of the king on the demise of his beloved wife (VIII, 44-69) along with the previous description of the death of Indumatī with flowers and the following narration of how Aja too with a broken heart dies is one of the gems of Indian poetry, such as since has long been welcomed into German literature through the translation of Friedrich Ruckert. Here are quoted some of the verses from Ruckert's retranslation into English :

14. "*pratiyojayitavyavallakīsamāvasthāmatha sattvaviplavāt* |
sa nināya nitāntavatsalaḥ parigṛhyocitamaṅkamaṅganām ||
"He, who had loved her so much,
Lifting her into his arms,
Carried her, like a lute,
Awaiting re-stringing
With breath while bearing her."

43. *vilalāpa sa bāṣpagadgadaṃ sahajāmapyapahāya dhīratām* |
abhitaptamayopi mārdavaṃ bhajati kā hi kathā śarīriṣu. ||
"He lost his natural self-control,
And, with tears welling up, was sobbing violently,
His voice was choked;
Even iron, when it is heated, becomes soft;
What to talk of animals that are corporeal beings."

44. "*kusumānyapi gātrasaṃgamāt prabhavantyāyurapohituṃ yadi* |
na bhaviṣyati hanta sādhanaṃ kimivānyatpraharişyato vidheḥ ||
"When even flowers, on account of contact
With human body, can take away life,
Alas ' What is then there, that cannot become
A deadly weapon in the hand of Fate, when it is eager to strike".

45. *athavā mṛdu vastu hiṃsituṃ mṛdunaivārabhate prajāntakaḥ* |
himasekavipattiratra me nalinī pūrvanidarśanaṃ gatā ||

"Or it may be that only with a delicate weapon,
The ender of life undertakes to strike one that is soft;
An illustration thereof is seen in the lotus,
That is destroyed with the shower of frost."

54. *tadapohitumarhasi priye pratibodhena viṣādamāśu me* ।
jvalitena guhāgataṁ tamastuhinādreriva naktamoṣadhīḥ ॥
"Mayest thou, O Darling, rise again,
And make my grief vanish at once,
Like the plant with its blaze at night,
The darkness of the cave of the Himālayan mountain."

55. *idamucchvasitālakaṁ mukhaṁ*
tava viśrāntakathaṁ dunoti mām ।
niśi suptamivaikapaṅkajaṁ
viratābhyantaraṣaṭpadasvanam ॥
"But thy face, with its shaking hairs,
That has ceased to converse, pains me;
Like the unitary lotus at night,
That is closed, and the bee no more hums in it."

66. *gṛhiṇī sacivaḥ sakhī mithaḥ priyaśiṣyā lalite kalāvidhau* ।
karuṇāvimukhena mṛtyunā haratā tvāṁ vada kiṁ na me hṛtam ॥
"Mistress of my house, advisor, a lady friend,
A pet disciple in fine arts,
The pitiless Death, that has deprived me of thee,
What has he not taken away from me ?"

He does not ascend the pyre with his wife, not because he hopes to live, but for fear of the scandal that people will say "Being a king, he was so much aggrieved that he died with his wife !"

pramadāmanu saṁsthitaḥ śucā nṛpatiḥ sannitivācyadarśanāt ॥

The teacher is able to offer him only feeble consolation, and he desires to live further only for the sake of his son. When the latter becomes capable to administer the affairs of the government, Aja voluntarily lets himself die of stravation to be reunited with his beloved in the heaven.

The following cantos (IX—XV) closely agree in contents with the Rāmāyaṇa. Here Kālidāsa shows his skill chiefly in descriptions. The successors of Rāma are just briefly described in cantos XVI-XVIII. All the same, they too are ideal kings.

A noteworthy exception, however, is King Agnivarṇa, who has been described in canto XIX. This ruler devotes only a little of his time to the affairs of the state that he has entrusted to his ministers, whilst he wholly enjoys his youth in the company of women. Day and night he wastes his time in lust and sexual pleasures, without troubling in the least in the interest of his subjects. When they want to see him, he shows them his arm, having stretched it through a window of the palace. Like a butterfly he flies from flower to flower. He runs unsatiably after sexual pleasure. He considers the moment in which he does not rejoice the company of women as lost[1]. Due to his licentious character he loses his health. Consumption brings his life to a premature end before a son is born to him. But his first queen is then pregnant and the ministers allow her to be consecrated as Her Majesty. The heat of tears that the widow sheds at the death of her husband is cooled with the coronation-water poured over her head from the spouts of golden jars, and she carries on the administration on behalf of her unborn child, concealed in her womb, like a corn-seed in the womb of the earth, and whose birth is anxiously awaited by the people.

With this the canto XIX comes to an end; but it is improbable that the poem too ended with it. In case the birth of the prince had been described[2], it could be said to have ended happily. With the text, that is available, not only does the poet leave us in uncertainty with regard to the fate of the successors of Agnivarṇa, but the epic ends really tragically, a thing which is against the practice of the Indian poets. Likewise the benedictory stanza, in which Indian poetry usually ends, is wanting.

1. It seems Kālidāsa tries to demonstrate his knowledge of the science of love, Kāmaśāstra, in this canto. Winternitz expresses his inability to be so enthusiastic as J. J. Meyer (Translation of the Daśakumāracarita, Introduction, p. 197, note), who says: "The canto XIX of the Raghuvaṁśa offers an outstanding picture, executed with classical serenity and Indian ardour, of an Indian Don Juan in his character of a mighty dare-devil and wordly man, in whom an ingenious gracefulness is natural. The canto belongs to a work that is most excellent on the whole, abounding in beautiful passages, but is so tragic towards the end". R. Schmidt, Liebe und Ehe in alten und modernen Indien, Berlin 1904, p. 134, gives a German translation of canto XIX, 1-57.

2. As is the case in v. Schack's translation against of the text.

Whether more cantos or only pairs of verses are lost to us—both being possible—we are not able to take a decision[1].

The fact that both of the epics of Kālidāsa belong to the most famous productions of court-poetry is proved not only by the frequent references to them in works on poetics, but also by the large number of commentaries that exist on each of both the works. There are more than 20 different commentaries on the Raghuvaṁśa and not less than 33 on the Kumārasaṁbhava[2]. The epics of Kālidāsa surpass all later epics in matter of simplicity of language and scrupulous avoidance of subtlity.

Among the many works that are wrongly attributed to Kālidāsa is found also the Prākrit epic Rāvaṇavaha (The Killing of Rāvaṇa) or the Setubandha (Construction of the Bridge)[3], that describes in an elegant style the Rāma-legend from the expedition of Rāma for rescuing Sītā upto the death of Rāvaṇa (in fifteen cantos.). Probably the author of this work is Pravarasena II of Kashmir or one of his court poets[4]. Daṇḍin (Kāvyā-

1. Viṭṭhalaśāstrin testified in 1866 that the descendants of Kālidāsa then living at Dhārā possessed 26 cantos of the Raghuvaṁśa (Pandit, Vol. 1, p. 141), whilst Shankar P. Pandit had heard about it in 1874 (Raghuvaṁśa Ed., Preface, p. 15) that somebody in Ujjain possessed cantos XX-XXV of the Raghuvaṁśa. But till now nothing has come to light about these cantos that are claimed to have existed before. The commentaries too know only 19 cantos. Hillebrandt, Kālidāsa, p. 42, considers the last two cantos (XVIII and XIX) as spurious, simply because they appear to him of little value and devoid of taste. But since Mallinātha has commented upon these cantos, Winternitz does not consider them as spurious, especially because Hillebrandt has not refuted their high antiquity. [C. Kunhan Raja, Annals of Or. Res., Madras, V, Part 2, pp. 17-40 attempts to question the anthenticity of the entire second-half of the Raghuvaṁśa, starting with the story of Daśaratha: but the argument advanced by him is not convincing.]

2. Cf. Aufrecht, CC. s. vv. and Nandargikar, Raghuvaṁśa Ed., Preface, p. 26.

3. Prākrit and German, published by S. Goldschmidt. With a word-index by Paul Goldschmidt and the editor, Strassburg 1880-84. Cf. Weber, Ind. Stud. 18, 413 ff., 447 ff. With the commentary of Rāmadāsa, published in Km. 47, 1895.

4. From Bāṇa's Harṣacarita, Introductory verse 15, Peterson (Kādambarī, Intr. p. 77ff.) first of all concluded that Pravarasena was the writer of Setubandha. It is also possible that he was simply a patron of an unknown poet. Cf. Lévi, Théatre Indien, App. p. 58 and see above p. 49; Konow, Karpūramañjarī, p. 194 ff. [WK—Pravarsena was of the Vakataka family, a grand'son of Candragupta II, identified with Pravarasena II of Kashmir [thus also Keith, HSL, 97]. It was even supposed that the poem was composed by Kālidāsa on the occasion of construction of the boat-bridge over the Vitastā (Jhelum) by Pravarasena II (see Rājataraṅgiṇī, III, 358). Cf S. Lêvi, Theatre Indien, App., p. 58; Konow, Karpūramañjarī in HOS,

darśa I, 34) refers to the Setubandha as an example of a work written in Māhārāṣṭrī, the most elegant Prākrit dialect. In any case its importance lies more on the linguistic side[1]. The style is unusually bombastic, full of far-fetched similes, puns, alliterations and long compounds, sometimes covering entire lines. In spite of all sorts of artificiality and affectations in style and language, the work, in any case, exhibits extraordinary perfection. It must be conceded that in many places the work shows real poetic skill, as near about the place where Rāma warns the ocean, for example, V, 34:—

ṇavari a saraṇibbhiṇṇo balaāmuhavihuakesarasaduggbāo ।
uddhāio rasanto visatthapasutta kesarivva samuddo ॥

"Bellowing, now the ocean stirs the sub-marine fire,
Like a lion that roars and shakes his mane,
With anger, after he is aroused from deep slumber,
Having been pierced through by an arrow."

It is a matter of inquiry as to why such an epic was written in Prākrit. In style and artificiality it is similar to Sanskrit epics, and it is difficult to believe that the readers of these poems were different from those of written in Sanskrit had. More than any Sanskrit epic, it presupposes not only a cultured, but also a very learned general public. From this it may be possible to presume that in the court of Pravarasena, Sanskrit had an inferior recognition to that of Prākrit. But it seems more probable that the poet just wanted to demonstrate that all the difficulties of language could be overcome in Prākrit too, and that all the devices of the Kāvya-style could be employed there as well[2].

Another work, that is frequently attributed to Kālidāsa is

Vol. 4, p. 194 f. F. G. Peterson (JRAS, 1926, p. 725f.) considers the statement of Rāmadāsa (on I, 9) that Kālidāsa wrote the poem to be correct. The colophon at the end (Km. ed.) describes it as the joint work of Pravarsena and Kālidāsa. See also S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar in Ashutosh Mem. Vol., p. 152f. It is not probable that a Māhārāṣṭrī poem should have been written in Kashmir of all places. S. K. De, HSL., p. 119 thinks that the date of Pravarsena is unknown and that probably he may have reigned in Kashmir in the 5th century A. D.]

1. Cf. Pischel, GGA, 1880, 321 ff. and Grammatik der Prākrit Sprachen, p. 12, [transl. p. 11.]

2. In any case, it is noteworthy that upto the period of the reign of Akbar the Great (1556-1605) this work continued to interest the people. Rāmadāsa wrote his commentary in 1596 A. D. under orders of Akbar, and Akbar's son Jahāngir got a Sanskrit translation of the Rāvaṇavaha prepared.

Nalodaya[1], although, on account of its style it could not have belonged to a great poet. We nowhere find in Kālidāsa such artificial metres, such fine rhymes and such a work of artistically developed kāvya-style as are presented by this poem. The epic describes in four cantos the well-known tale of Nala and Damayantī "in so artificial a form that to turn an Iliad into sonnets would be a child's play compared to it"[2]. The poet shows extreme fascination for internal rhyming (yamaka)[3] and alliteration. Perhaps the writer of the Nalodaya is Ravideva, son of Nārāyaṇa, who wrote also (as is often the case with Indian poets) a commentary on his own work. Ravideva is the writer of also a small poem of 20 stanzas, Kāvyarākṣasa or Rākṣasakāvya[4], upon which too he wrote a commentary likewise, and what is composed in the same style, a work that in the matter of lack of taste and in euphemism is similar to the Nalodaya and like-wise is attributed to Kālidāsa[5]. We, however, know nothing more about Ravideva or his age[6].

Here we must make mention of a poet who is frequenly referred to in Indian tradition as a contemporary of Kālidāsa,

1. Nalodaya, Sanscriticum carmen Calidaso adscriptum una cum Pradschnacari Mithilensis scholiis ed. latina interpretatione..... instruxit F. Benary, Berolini 1830. Nalodaya, accompanied with a metrical translation by W. Yates, Calcutta 1844. In German (reproduction) by Ad. Fr. Grafen von Schack, Stimmen vom Ganges (Stuttagart 1877), p. 219-280. [cf. Bhandarkar, Report, 1883-84, p. 16. A. R. S. Ayyar, JRAS, 1925, pp. 263 ff. attests Vāsudeva as the author also of Yudhiṣṭhiravijaya, Tripuradahana and Śaurikathodaya.]

2. Friedrich Rückert in Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik 1829, p. 536. Rückert, ibid, p. 536 ff. has described the metrics and art of rhyming of Nalodaya and has translated a portion of canto II, ibid, 1831. Nr. 1 (also in Rückert-Nachlese I, 253 ff.). Cf. also W. Yates in As. Researches 20, 1836, p. 135 ff.

3. See also above p. 18.
[Keith, CSL, pp. 97ff. doubts Ravideva's being the writer of the Nalodaya, that he considers as having been written by Vāsudeva.]

4. Published by A. Hoefer, Sanskrit Lesebuch, Berlin, 1849, p. 86 ff. and by K. P. Parab, Bombay 1900; annotated and translated into Italian by F. Belloni-Fillipi in GSAI 19, 1906, 83 ff.

5. Pischel, ZDMG, 56, 1902, 626; 58, 1904, 244 f. Cf. Weber, Ind. Streifen II, 15; Peterson, Report IV, p. CV; 3 Reports, pp. 20, 334 ff.; Bhandarkar, Report 1883/84, p. 16.

6. According to Peterson, JBRAS 17, 1889, p. 69 note, Nalodaya was written in about 1608 A. D. [It is wrong. It was not Nalodaya, but a commentary on it, that Rāma Ṛṣi., son of Vṛddhavyāsa, wrote in 1608 A. V. Peterson; 3 Reports, p. 29 f.]

i.e., Kumāradāsa, whose epic Jānakīharaṇa[1], that narrates the tale of Rāma upto the time of the kidnapping of Sītā. Tradition ascribes the authorship of the poem to a Ceylonese king Kumāradāsa (517-526), who may have been a friend of Kālidāsa. But there are many indications that go to support the view that this poem of mediocre merit is of a later date. ["It is really beyond question that he knew the Kāśikāvṛtti (c. A. D. 650), while on the other hand he must have been known to Vāmana (c. A. D. 800), who censures the use of *khalu* as the first word, found in Kumāradāsa, and cites a stanza which in content and form proclaims itself as unquestionably a citation from the lost part of the Jānakīharaṇa. Finally, he was probably earlier than Māgha, who seems to echo a verse of his. Rājaśekhara, the poet (c. A. D. 900), asserts his fame :—

jānakīharaṇaṁ kartuṁ raghuvaṁśe sthite sati ı
kaviḥ kumāradāsaśca rāvaṇaśca yadi kṣamaḥ ıı

"No poet, save Kumāradāsa, could dare sing the rape of Sītā when the Raghuvaṁśa was current, even as none, but Rāvaṇa, could perform the deed, when Raghu's line existed"[2]. Whoever might have been this Kumāradāsa, he, in any case, had imitated Kālidāsa[3], without being able to attain his standard even remotely. He is much less referred to than Bhāravi and Māgha, and his style is most analagous to that of Kālidāsa.

In the Aihoḷe inscription (634 A.D.) of Pulakeśin II beside Kālidāsa is mentioned Bhāravi as a renowned poet. [As regards his age all that is known is that he must be placed much earlier

1. For a long time Jānakīharaṇa was known only in the "Sanna", i.e., the Singhalese word-for-word translation of the original. It had been published for the first time by G. R. Nandargikar (Bombay 1907). [Other editions are of Haridasa Sastri, Calcutta 1893; canto XVI, ed. by L. D. Barnett from a Malayālam MS in BSOS, IV, p. 285 f., (Roman text) to which addl. readings have been furnished from a Madras MS by S. K. De, in BSOS IV, p. 611 f.] The text of Nandargikar's Kumāradāsa and his place in Sanskrit Literature, Poona 1908 was not accessible to Winternitz. The poem has been dealt with by J. d'Alwis 1870; Zachariae, Bezz. Beitr. 5. 1880, p. 52, GGA, 1887, p.95; JBRAS Peterson 17, 1889, 57 ff. and Subh. 24 f.; E. Leumann, WZKM 7, 1893, 226 ff.; F. W. Thomas, JRAS 1901, 253 ff; A. B. Kieth, ibid 578 ff. The work is often quoted in anthologies, see Thomas 34 ff., who gives "seventh century" as his date. [See S. K. De, HSL, pp. 185 ff. Only this much is certain that Kumāradāsa is older than Rājaśekhara, who mentions him.]

[2. Kieth, CSL, p. 119; G.R.Nandargīkar, Kumāradāsa, His place in Sanskrit Literature, Poona, 1908.]

3. Cf. O. Walter, Übereinstimmungen in Gedanken, Vergleichen und Wendungen bei indischen Kunstdichtern, Leipzig 1905, p. 18 ff.

than 634 A.D.] In Indian manuals of poetics he is always included among the greatest poets. His epic Kirātārjunīya[1], according to the unanimous verdict of the Indians, belongs to the best type of classical poetry. The theme of the 18 cantos of the epic consists of the story of the battle of the hero Arjuna with the god Śiva, who assumed the form of a Kirāta[2]. But the narration is not of any importance whatsoever. The real importance of the poem lies in interlaced descriptions, magnificent metaphors and similes and mastery in handling of the language, that reaches its highest point notably in canto XV. Here we find, e.g. verses in which only particular consonants occur (thus XV, 5 only *s*, *y*, *l* and *ś* or XV, 16, in which there is no consonant other than *n*), verses of which the two hemistichs have the same reading, but they give different meanings; then there are stanzas, in which each foot reads similarly, whether read from the beginning to the end or from the end to the beginning. Although these verbal gymnastics, like the devices of an acrobat, can no more inspire in us a feeling of admiration, we come across many splendid sketches in the description of nature that exhibit the genious of a true poet. For example we may refer to the beautiful description of the autumn in canto IV[3], to the lovely bathing scene in canto VIII[4] and to the description of the setting of the sun and of the advent of the night in canto IX. Here we find beautiful pictures, when for example, the poet says:—

aṁśupāṇibhiratīvapipāsuḥ padmajaṁ madhu bhṛśaṁ rasayitvā ।
kṣībatāmiva gataḥ kṣitimeṣyaṁllohitaṁ vapuruvāha pataṅgaḥ ॥

"It seems as if the extremely thirsty sun, having excessively drunk with the hands of his rays the honey

1. A good edition with the commentary of Mallinātha has been published at Bombay NSP (6th ed., 1907). C. Schuetz, Bielefeld 1845 has translated the first two cantos into German. A complete German translation by C. Cappeller in HOS, Vol. 15. [Only cantos I-III, with the commentary of Citrabhānu, ed. Gaṇapati Sāstrī, TSS. 1918, On the austensible relation of Bhāravi and Daṇḍin, see S. K. De in IHQ, I, 1925, p. 31 f., III, 1927, p. 396; Harihara Sastri in IHQ III, 1927, p. 169 f., who would place Bhāravi and Daṇḍin at the close of the 7th century A. D.]. Walter loc. cit. p. 24 ff. shows that Bhāravi was influenced by Kālidāsa. Kirātārjunīya has been cited in the Kaśikā (Kielhorn, Ind. Ant. 14, 327).

2. Mahābhārata 3, 39 f.; see above, Vol. I, p. 292, transl. p. 347.

3. Translated into German by M. Haberlandt in "Wiener Landwirtschaftl. Zeitung" 1883.

4. VIII, 27 ff. translated into German by Rückert in Jahrbücher fur wissenschaftl. Kritik, 1831, p. 15 f. (also in Rueckert—Nachlese, I, 265 ff.).

extracted from day-lotuses, has got intoxicated and desirous of getting to earth looks to wear a reddish body" (IX, 3), or when he compares the rising moon with a silver bowl brought for the purpose of coronation of the god of love by the night comparable to a beautiful woman (IX, 32) :

saṁvidhātumabhiṣekamudāse manmathasya lasadaṁśujalaughaḥ ।
yāminīvanitayā tatacihnaḥ sotpalo rajatakumbha ivenduḥ ॥

"For Love's coronation the lady-night raised aloft the moon with his shimmering sea of beams and his spots full in view, like a sliver bowl decked with lotuses."

The Indians indeed rejoice most at the most far-fetched and most seldom similes. They have, therefore, given our poet the epithet "Sunshade—Bhāravi (*Cātapatra bhāravi*)" because at one place he compares the lotus-pollens scattered from a cluster of lotuses by stormy wind with the goddess Lakṣmī reflecting her image in a golden sunshade[1].

The Kirātārjunīya served as model for Māgha's epic the Śiśupālavadha[2], that is likewise esteemed as one of the most important pieces of poerty. [The usually accepted date of Māgha is the latter part of the 7th century A.D. But what appears as fairly certain is that the lower inmost limit to his age is provided by the quotations from his poem by Vāmana (c. 800 A.D.) and Ānandavardhana (900 A. D.). In a stanza found in the Śiśupālavadha, he says that his grand'father Suprabhavadeva was a minister of a king Varmala (*v. v. ll.* Varmalāta, Dharmanābha, Dharmanātha and Nirmalāta), of whom an inscription of c. 625 A.D. exists. But this date and identification of the king have not been proved beyond doubt.][3]

Māgha attempts to surpass his model Bhāravi in

[1. *utphullasthalanalinīvanādamuṣmāduddhūtaḥ sarasijasaṁbhavaḥ parāgaḥ* ।
vātyābhirviyati vivartitaḥ samantādādhatte kanakamayātapatralakṣmīm ॥
The proper translation will be:—The pollen that has issued forth from the lotus of the lotus-cluster growing on the yonder piece of land, full of blossoms, whirled about in the sky by the wind, assumes the beauty of an umbrella of gold. (V. 39)]

Cf. Peterson, OC VI Leiden, III, 2, 339 ff.

2. Edition with the commentary of Mallinātha in NSP, 5th Ed., Bombay 1910, German translation (in prose) of cantos I-XI of C. Schuetz, Bielefeld 1843. Extracts translated by C. Cappeller, Stuttgart, 1915. [Complete German translation according to the commentaries of Vallabhadeva and Mallinātha-Hultzsch, Leipzig, 1929].

[3. Cf. S. K. De, HSL, pp. 188 ff.]

each one the devices and affectations of subtlety[1]. Like Bhāravi in canto IV of the Kirātārjunīya, Māgha tries to show his skill in metrics in canto IV of the Śiśupālavadha. Whilst Bhāravi has used only 19 different types of metres, Māgha uses 23 of them[2]. Again like canto XV that is devoted to the description of the battle and shows artificiality, alliteration and play of words at the most in the Kirātārjunīya, Māgha introduces in his canto XIX, that is devoted to the description of the battle, more and more similar complicated devices. Here we find verses that give a second meaning when read from below, of which the syllables which read according to different devices form all sorts of figures in zigzag way, in a circle etc., and verses in which only particular consonants occur, e.g. the formidable verse.

jajaujojājijijjāji taṁ tatotitatātitut ।
bhābhobhībhābhibhūbhābhūrārārirarirīraraḥ ॥

"Then the warrior, winner of war, with his heroic valour, the subduer of the extremely arrogant beings, he who has the brilliance of the stars, he who has the brilliance of the vanquisher of fearless elephants, the enemy seated on a chariot, started to fight" (XIX, 3).

In case it was Bhāravi's endeavour to eulogise Śiva, Māgha pursues the religious objective of extolling Viṣṇu. He too has drawn his material from the Mahābhārata, and that from the section on the slay of Śiśupāla by Kṛṣṇa[3]. The poet, however, is not entirely dependant upon the legend as he finds it in the Mahābhārata. His main interest lies in descriptions and sketches, that get into motion with predilection towards the erotic domain; nevertheless the subject-matter itself has in the least to do with erotics. Almost half of the twenty cantos of the extant epic has nothing to do with the proper story.

The second canto offers the poet an opportunity to display his knowledge of nītiśāstra, the science of politics. Here we find several nice aphorisms. Thus for example II, 44 :—

1. Cf. Jacobi, WZKM, 3, 1889, 121 ff., 141 ff. [E. Hultzsch, ZDMG, 72, 1918.; p. 147 shows that he had used also the Bhaṭṭikāvya.]

[2. Cf. Belloni-Phillipi—La Metrica degli Indi, Firenze, 1912, ii. p, 55.; Keith, HSL.pp. 130-31; Jacobi, Ind. Stud., XVII. p.444f. and in Verhandl. des V or. Congress, p. 136 f.].

3. Mahābhār. II, 33-45; see above I, 287, trans. p. 341.

anyadā bhūṣaṇaṁ puṁsaḥ kṣamā lajjeva yoṣitaḥ ।
parākramaḥ paribhave vaiyātyaṁ surateṣviva ॥
"Otherwise, patience is decoration of a man
Like bashfulness of a woman;
But it is heroism that adds lustre to man
When in disgrace, like shamelessness
In amorous sports to a woman".

or as II, 86

nāvalambate daiṣṭikatāṁ na niṣīdati pauruṣe ।
śabdārthau satkaviriva dvayaṁ vidvānapekṣate ॥
"Not exclusively on Fate,
Not wholly on his own manhood,
Does a wise man depend absolutely,
But upon both of them, he does rely equally,
Like a good poet, on both, word and meaning".

In the matter of selection of his similes Māgha tries to be as much original as possible. Thus he (II, 18) compares the drops of sweat of Balarāma's body, that became reddish on account of his anger towards his enemy, with the stars that appear in the red sky of the evening. The Indian literary critics, however, call the poet "Bell-Māgha"[1] because of his extraordinary sketch in IV, 20, where he compares a mountain with the setting sun on one of its sides and the rising moon on the other to an elephant, having one bell hanging from the back on each of his sides. Māgha is also a master of play of words and in the use of expressions having two meanings. In canto XVI there appears a messenger of Śiśupāla and delivers to Kṛṣṇa his message that is purposely so worded as to bear two meanings—the same stanzas offer an humble apology expressed in courteous words and constitute an impudent declaration of war at the same time[2].

But the chief credit of Māgha lies in the sphere of erotics.

---

1. Ghaṇṭāmāgha; see Peterson, OC VI Leiden III, 2, 339 ff. [Cf. Mālatī Sen. COJ. I, 58 ff.).

2. For example XVI, 2:—

abhidhāya tadā tadapriyaṁ śiśupālonuśayaṁ paraṁ gataḥ ।
bhavatobhimanah samīhate saruṣaḥ kartumupetya mānanām ॥

"Śiśupāla, having merited your displeasure, in deep regret (in high anger) seeks eagerly (fearlessly) to come before you and pay due homage (slay you)".]

The Indian poets cannot fully describe a city without depicting in glowing colours the beauty of the women living in it, and the description of the seasons, of the evening or of the morning helps them in describing the activities of the heroines. Our poet takes all these to the extreme point.

When he describes a campaign and a military camp (canto V) he does not forget to describe the troop carrying the queen in a chariot and the women of the harem, who are riding horses and donkeys, to bring before our eyes the women who fall fast asleep in their tents on account of fatigue and to tell us how the courtesans are dressing themselves for reception of men. We follow not only the warriors and the elephants even into their bath but also the women; and the poet describes how "water gathers in the deep navel cavities of women, how it is checked back by the high embankment of their hips, how then, producing lovely music, it glides over the banks of their firm breasts and then slowly flows about" (V, 29). This sort of thing may appear unsavoury to the people of the West, but it has certainly delighted very much the Indian readers and listeners. Likewise in canto VI the description of all the six seasons that present themselves in the form of beautiful women, one after another, with the intention of pleasing Viṣṇu appears to the people of the West far-fetched; but the poet has thereby created an opportunity to show his skill in erotic description. To the western mind it appears hardly appropriate, when in the following cantos the Yādavas are reported to be walking with beautiful women in the forest and bathing with them in the pond instead of moving into the field of battle. But the poet utilizes the background of the forest and of the pond for the purpose of repeatedly bringing in erotic descriptions of the thighs, that are as stout as the trunks of elephants, of the heavy hips, of the tight breasts, that are like full pitchers and jumping foals at the same time (VII, 73) etc. of beautiful women. When lastly (at the end of canto VIII) the brilliant-rayed sun-god sees how the Yādavas burst forth in splendour of perfect beauty on account of their bath in the pond, he too wishes to plunge in the water of the Western Ocean. And this gives him the desired

opportunity to describe the sunset and rising of the moon in canto IX. But the moon enflames the god of love, and we see again the young damsels preparing themselves for reception of their lovers and sending their eyes and their female messengers of love (IX, 55). Then the advent of the night offers him the welcome opportunity of describing the preliminary orgies of love preceded by a carousal in canto X. But "these people continue to scratch and bite each other when they love one another", as already remarked by R u e c k e r t. X, 72:—

bāhupīḍanakacagrahaṇābhyāmāhatena nakhadantanipātaiḥ ।
bodhitastanuśayastaruṇīnāmunmimīla viśadaṁ viṣameṣuḥ ॥

"By pressings of the arm and tearing of the hair,
By inflicting wound with the nails and the teeth,
The god of love, slumbering in the delicate bodies of women,
Is aroused, and he rubs their bright eyes".

But there remains no doubt that he had studied treatises on love. Māgha compares the voluptuous sounds and other noises of the enjoyment of sexual pleasure with the words of Kāmasūtra (X, 75). Next later in canto XI the early morning and the awakening from the night of love are described, and the poet again turns towards the military events. But here too, the poet does not describe the entry of Kṛṣṇa into the city of Pāṇḍavas (XIII, 30 ff.) without depicting in detail the conduct of the women of the city on this occasion. That he is able to describe the horrors of a battle too is probably shown by several verses in canto XVIII. Yet these descriptions read rather as those of a man who draws the picture according to his imagination without having ever seen a battle-field.

In the manuals of poetics Māgha's Śiśupālavadha is quoted very frequently[1], from which we can see, as to the extent to which the Indian scholars of poetics held him in high esteem.

Māgha has been most zealously imitated also by R ā j ā n a k a R a t n ā k a r a, son of Amṛtabhānu, whose epic H a r a v i j a y a[2] in

1. Cf. J a c o b i, WZKM 4, 1890, p. 236 ff., and C. C a p p e l l e r in Festschrift Kuhn 294ff. [On Māgha's scholarship in other branches of knowledge, See E. H u l t z s c h in Festgable Garbe, p. 78 ff., and Māgha's Śiśupālavadha, ins. Deutsche uebertragen, p. V.]

2. With the commentary of Rājānaka Alaka published in Km. 22, 1890. R. S c h m i d t, WZKM 29, 259, ff. deals with the book from lexicographical point of view. [On the author see p. 53.]

50 cantos reveals a thorough study of the Śiśupālavadha[1]. The theme of the poem is the defeat of the asura Andhaka [who was born blind of Śiva himself, regained his eye-sight by his penances and became a menace to gods] by Śiva. But the poet utilizes the opportunity of introducing all the descriptions prescribed in a kāvya and of displaying his knowledge of nītiśāstra (in cantos VIII—XVI) as well as of Kāmaśāstra (in canto XXIX). In the description of a battle (in canto XLVII) a hymn to the terrible goddess Durgā (Caṇḍīstotra) has been inserted. Another work of the same poet is Vakroktipañcāśikā or "Fifty Stanzas with Vakroktis" (speeches with two meanings, play of words)[2].

[Ratnākara tells us that he wrote his Haravijaya under the patronage of prince Cippaḍa Jayāpīḍa (832-44 A. D.), and we learn from Kalhaṇa that he was prominent under Avantivarman, who began his reign in 855 A. D. Hence this furnishes us with information about the age of this writer.

Under the same king Avantivarman, lived the Buddhist poet Śivasvāmin, the author of the epic Kapphiṇābhyudaya[3] written on the model of Bhāravi, Māgha and Ratnākara. The theme of the epic is the legend of the Avadānaśataka of Kapphiṇa, a king of the South, who is an enemy of the king of Śrāvastī but becomes a Buddhist convert.]

Another poet, who took Māgha as his model, is Jaina Haricandra, who has described the life of Tīrthaṁkara Dharmanātha in a great epic (in 21 cantos) Dharmaśarmābhyudaya[4]. Since he has imitated also the Gaüḍavaha of Vākpati he must have lived after the 8th century A. D.

The extant court ornate poetry being learned poerty too is shown more significantly by nothing than by the epic Rāvaṇavadha ("The Slay of Rāvaṇa") of the poet Bhaṭṭi, commonly

1. Jacobi, loc cit. 240 ff. Ratnākara himself says that he has imitated Bāṇa. K. H. Dhruva, WZKM 5, 1891, 25 ff.

2. Published with the commentary of Vallabhadeva in Km., Part I, 101, 114. C. Bernheimer, ZDMG 63, 1909, 816 ff. gives samples from this work. Ratnākara is the author of one Dhvanigāthāpañjikā. Both the works have been cited by Ruyyaka.

[3. See Report on the Search of MSS., Madras, 1893-94, p. 49 ff. Cf. Thomas, Kavi. p. 111 ff.; Keith, HSL, 133 f.; S. K. De, HSL, p. 320. Ed. Gaurishankar, Punjab Univ. Or. Pub. Ser., Lahore 1937.]

4. Published in Km. 8, 1888; see Jacobi, WZKM, 3, 1889, 136 ff.

designated as Bhaṭṭikāvya[1], an epic in 22 cantos, narrates the tale of Rāma and tries to illustrate with examples the rules of grammar and poetics at the same time. The poem is divided into four parts (kāṇḍas), of which the first part (=cantos first-fifth) seeks to give examples of miscellaneous rules of Pāṇini's grammar and the second one (=cantos VI to IX), those of its main rules, whilst in the third section (=cantos X to XIII) the most important alaṁkāras[2] are illustrated and in the fourth the uses of tenses moods are explained. Moreover, it is sufficiently significant that Indians always hold Bhaṭṭikāvya as a work of poetry in high estimation and include it among their classical poetical works, and in fact it fully deserves the name of a "mahākāvya". Besides, it is considered as authoritative on questions relating to grammar[3]. The writer himself says at the end (XXII, 33 f.).

dīpatulyaḥ prabhandhoyaṁ śabdalakṣaṇacakṣuṣām ।
hastādarśa ivāndhānāṁ bhavedvyākaraṇādṛte ॥
vyākhyāgamyamidaṁ kāvyaṁ utsavaḥ sudhiyāmalam ।
hatā durmedhasaścāsmin vidvatpriyatayā mayā ॥

"This work is like a lamp for those whose eye is grammar, but it is like a mirror in the hand of the blind for the people without knowledge of grammar. This poem can be understood only with the help of a commentary; then it is a feast for the

1. That is to say "Bhaṭṭi's poem", as also the Śiśupālavadha, is often called "Māghakāvya". The Bhaṭṭikāvya has been published with the oldest commentary Jayamaṅgalā of Jayamangala by Govinda Shankara Shāstrī Bāpata in NSP Bombay 1887, and with the commentary of Mallinātha by K. P. Trivedi in BSS 1898. The cantos XVIII-XXII have been translated into German, by C. Schütz, "Fünf Gesänge des Bhaṭṭikāvya" in the Bericht über das Gymnasium in Bielefeld 1837. P. Anderson, JBRAS, 3, 1850, p. 20 ff. gives some probes of a poetical translation of the beginning of the poem. The first four cantos with English commentary have been published by V. G. Pradhan, Poona, 1897. [Ed J. N. Tarkaratna with the commentaries of Jayamaṅgala and Bharatamallika in 2 vols, Calcutta 1871-73; (Reprint 1808): cantos I-V in Sanskrit and English, ed. Kunjalal Nag, Dacca, 1894.]

2. It cannot be decided with certainty as to the authority that Bhaṭṭi follows in this section. In the matter of sequence of alaṁkāras he seems to follow Udbhaṭa's Alaṁkārasaṁgraha (according to Trivedi in his edition, vol. II, notes p. 9). Kane (Ind. Ant. 1912, p. 208) places him between Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha. Bhaṭṭikāvya has been cited by Ruyyaka. We do not know if a conclusion is to be drawn from the bhāṣāśleṣa (puns, in which the same verses are to be read once in Sanskrit and once in Prākrit.) in canto XII). [But Ānandavardhana furnishes one of its examples. Cf. S. K. De, Poetics, I, p. 50 ff.; HSL, p. 183;] The oldest manuals on the Ālaṁkaraśāstra do not mention this śleṣa.

3. Bhaṭṭi is frequently cited particularly by the grammarian Kramadīśvara; see Zachariae in Bezz. Beitr. 5, 1880, 53 ff.

learned. Since I am concerned only with experts, in this poem I hope to have disappointed the ignorant". The fact, that there exist 13 different commentaries on the Bhaṭṭikāvya, gives testimony to the authoritative nature of this work. The name Bhaṭṭi is a Prākrit form for Bhartṛ. This must be at the root of the fact that sometimes the author of this epic is identified or is brought in close relationship with Bhartṛhari, the gnomic poet and grammarian[1].

The Bhaṭṭikāvya is not the solitary epic in which the aim of the poet has been associated with that of the grammarian. A similar work is Rāvaṇārjunīya (or Arjunarāvaṇīya)[2], a work mentioned as śāstra-kāvya by Kṣemendra, and therefore, belonging to a period earlier than the 11th century A. D., (of Bhaumaka)[3], well-known in Kashmir. It is a great epic (mahākāvya) in 27 cantos. The fight of Arjuna Kārttavīrya against Rāvaṇa, following the story narrated in the Rāmāyaṇa (VII, 31-33), forms the theme. But the chief purpose of the work is to illustrate the rules of Pāṇini's grammar[4].

1. Bhaṭṭi is mentioned as a son or half-brother of Bhartṛhari. Many of the commentators directly call the author Bhartṛhari, son of Śrīdharasvāmin. The names Bhaṭṭasvāmin and Bhartṛsvāmin too are given. Chronologically (see above p.50) it is possible that Bhaṭṭi may have been a relation of Bhartṛhari. Cf. Kane, Ind. Ant. 1912, p. 128.

[The author of the Bhaṭṭikāvya tells us that he wrote it at Valabhī under Śrīdharasena. (This stanza has not been commented upon by Mallinātha). But there have been four kings of this name, the last of whom died in A. D., 641, and all that we know is that he must have lived before this period. The time of all of them is posterior to 495 A. D. Therefore, the earliest period in which Bhaṭṭi could have lived cannot be before the 5th century A. D.

B.C. Majumdar, JRAS, 1904, p. 306 f. has suggested that our author may have been identical with Vatsabhaṭṭi of the Mandasor inscription, but this suggestion lacks all plausibility. See Keith, JRAS 1909, p. 435 and also Hultzsch, ZDMG, LXXII, 1908, p. 145. Although the work was known to Bhāmaha, this fact helps us little in determining the age of Bhaṭṭi, since the age of Bhāmaha is equally uncertain.]

2. Published in Km. 68, 1900. [It is cited also under the name Vyoṣa or Vyoṣakāvya. Cf. K. C. Chatterji, IHQ, 7, 1931, 628 and Zachariae in ZII, 9, 1932, p. 10 ff.]

3. The author is designated also as Bhaṭṭabhauma or Bhaṭṭabhīma or Bhūma or Bhūmaka. Cf. Trivedi, loc. cit., Introd. I, p. X f.

4. The work has been cited in the Kāśikā. Kṣemendra in the Suvṛttatilaka, III, 4 refers to it as an example of Kāvyaśāstra (Manual of Form of Poetry).

[The editors of the work do not agree with the hypothesis that it is cited in Kāśikā See S. K. De, HSL, p. 336.]

A mention may here be made of Kavirahasya[1], "Mystery of Poet" of Halāyudha [10th century][2], another work of the same type, that is primarily grammatico-lexical and secondarily a peom. It is a kind of lexicon of roots (Dhātupāṭha), in which the forms of the present tense of Sanskrit verbs are illustrated. At the same time it is a metrical panegyric to King Kṛṣṇarāja III of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family who ruled in about 940-956 A. D. in the Deccan.

Hemacandra too wrote his historical epic Kumārapālacarita for illustrating the rules of his own grammar VI [and he devotes its twenty cantos to Sanskrit and eight cantos to Prākrit][3].

It is remarkable that the authors of the court-epics hardly have had the ambition to invent new themes. The old myths and heroic legends are used again and again in new forms. In fact their ambition is just to be able to show that they can dress the well-known and often-dealt-with themes in a new garb. Lolimbarāja (*c.* 1100 A.D.), who might have lived in the court of the south Indian king Harihara, a contemporary of King Bhoja[4], treats of the legend of Kṛṣṇa in his epic Harivilāsa[5] in five cantos, of which the third is devoted to descriptions one of the seasons and the fourth, to that of God Kṛṣṇa. Kṣemendra in the Daśāvatāracarita[6] extols the incarnations of Viṣṇu. Here one small canto is devoted to each one of the ten incar-

1. Published in both the recensions by L. Heller, Greifswald 1900. Cf. Bhandarkar, Report 1883-84, p. 8 f., ; L. Heller, Halāyudha's Kavirahasya, Diss., Göttingen 1894; Zachariae, Die indischen Wörterbücher, p. 26.

2. [Keith, CSL p. 18.]

3. See below p. 101. In the 18th century was written yet another grammatical epic, the Nakṣatramālā, by Tripāṭhī Śivarāma (published in Km. part V, 1888, 105-115). Of unknown antiquity are the two poems Vāsudevavijaya of a poet Vāsudeva [who probably lived in the court of King Vikrama of Calicut in Kerala] and Dhātukāvya by [Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭahari] (published in Km., Part X, 1894, 52-231), in which the legend of Kṛṣṇa is narrated, and at the same time the rules of Pāṇini's grammar and Dhātupāṭha are illustrated. [Cf. K. R. Pisharoti, BSOS, Vol. V, 4, 1930, p. 797 ff.]

4. Cf. Pandit, Vol. II, p. 78 f.; Weber, Ind. Streifen III, 210, A. 3, and Krishnamacharya, 120.

5. Published in the Pandit, Vol. II, 79 ff. 101 ff., and in Km., Part XI, 1895, 94-133. The Kṛṣṇa legend is told also in the Gopālalīlā of Rāmacandra (born 1484 in Tailinga), published in the Pandit, Vol. VI.

6. Published in Km. 26, 1891. On Buddhāvatara cf. A. Foucher, IA, 1892, s. 8, t. XX, 167ff., and J. J. Meyer, Altindische Schelmenbücher 'I p. XXXIII f, where the passage IX, 24 ff. has been translated into german.

nations (Fish, Tortoise, Boar, Man-lion, Dwarf, Paraśurāma, Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Buddha and *Kalki). In canto IX Buddha appears as Kṛṣṇa personified and the Buddha-legend is changed into a Viṣṇu-legend. In the case of the two other extant epics of Kṣemendra, Bharatamañjarī and Rāmāyaṇamañjarī[1], the contents of both of the epics have been made accessible to the reader in a convenient manner; but as remarked by S. Lévi[2], the poems are deprived of all beauty. Two centuries later (c. 1250) Jaina Amaracandra[3] further wrote Bālabhārata[4], an abridgment of the Mahābhārata, that like an ornate epic is divided into cantos (sargas), but at the same time follows the division into parvans as in the old epic. The poem, that was written during the period of reign of Viśāladeva of Aṇhilvad (1243-1261), shows high degree of versatility in the use of metres.

[Amaracandra, who was a pupil of Jinadattasūri, wrote also the epic Padmānanda[5] in 19 cantos, in which he has described the biography of the first Jina Ṛṣabha in ornate style. In another work, Caturviṁśatijinendrasaṁkṣipta-caritāni[6], he briefly describes the biography of all the 24 Jinas. In this poem the author wholly follows Hemacandra.[7]]

On one hand, old poems have been abridged, and on the other, famous prose works have been rendered into verses.

[* The word used by W. is Karki, an error for Kalki]

1. Published in Km. 65, 1898, and 83, 1903 respectively.

2. JA, 1885, s. 8, t. VI, 420, Lévi postulates the very probable hypothesis that the two works can be described simply as "poetical exercises", as Kṣemendra in the Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa recommends them to the beginner-poets. Since Bharatamañjarī and Daśāvatāracarita are respectively dated 1037 and 1066. A. D. all the three Mañjarīs may have been written by the poet in his early age.

3. Known also under the titles Amaracandrasūri. Amarapaṇḍita and Amarayati. The poet is the writer of works on poetics and prosody too.

4. Published in the Pandit, Vols. IV-VI and in Km. 45, 1894. D. Galanos has translated it into modern Greek (Athens 1847). Cf. Weber, ZDMG 27, 1873, 170 ff., Ind. Streifen 3, 211 ff.

[5. Ed. H. R. Kapadia, GOS, 58, 1932.]

[6. Ed. H. R. Kapadia, GOS, 58, 1932.]

[7. On the biographies of other Jinas, see above II p., trans. 504 ff. We may here add also Munisuvrata-Kāvyaratna, ed. TSS. 107, 1931.]

Thus the poet Abhinanda[1], son of Bhaṭṭa Jayanta, composed in the 9th century an epic Kādambarīsāra[2] on the basis of Bāṇa's novel "Kādambarī".

But the Indian poets have succeeded in composing much more difficult poetical pieces. Thus the poet Sandhyākara Nandi wrote an epic Rāmapālacarita[3], in which each stanza is to be taken as having two meanings : and in fact one of these meanings relates to the hero Rāma and at the same time the other to King Rāmapāla, who ruled over Bengal in the 11th century A. D. This poet was outdone by two other poets, each of whom tried to compose a great epic, in which the story of the Mahābhārata and of the Rāmāyaṇa are contained in such a manner that each individual stanza is capable of being interpreted as having two meanings, of which the one set narrates the story of the Pāṇḍavas and the other, that of Rāma. Of these two works, the older one is the Rāghavapāṇḍavīya or Dvisāndhānakāvya[4] of the Digambara-Jaina Dhanañjaya, who wrote it under the pen-name Śrutakīrti between 1123 and 1140 A.D[5]. Different from it is the Rāghavapāṇḍavīya[6] of a poet, who apparently calls himself Mādhavabhaṭṭa and is better known by the

1. He is called also Gauḍābhinanda. His great great grand'father Śaktisvāmin was a minister of the Kashmirian king Muktāpīḍa (699—735A.D.). In a stanza that is attributed to him he mentions the poet Rājaśekhara as his contemporary. Another Abhinanda, son of Śatānanda [of Bengal] probably of the 9th century A.D., composed an epic Rāmacarita, that narrates the story of Rāma from the beginning upto the abduction of Sītā. [He calls his patron Harivarṣa and Yuvarāja, who is perhaps King Devapāla (about 815-854 A.D.)] Cf. Bühler, Ind. Ant. 2, 1873, 102 ff; Thomas, p. 20. We do not know as to which of the Abhinandas is mentioned to be as reputed as Kālidāsa in a stanza (Aufrecht, ZDMG 27, p. 4; Śāraṅgadhara VIII, 5, where Acala and Amala are added).

[Ed. R. S. Rāmasvāmī Śāstri Śiromaṇi, GOS 46, 1930. Cf. also H. C. Roy, Dynastic History of Northern India, I. p. 290 ff and also Introd. p. XX in the above-mentioned edition.]

2. Published in Pandit, Vols. I, II and in Km. 11, 1888. Kṣemendra too wrote one Padyakādambarī. "Kādambarī in Verses", See I. Schönberg, Kṣemendras Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa, p. 6.

3. Published by Haraprasāda Śāstrī in the Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 3, 1910, pp. 1-56 Cf. Ep. Ind. IX, 321 f.

4. That is to say "The Poem with two Interpretations".

5. Cf. K. B. Pathak, JBRAS 21, 1904, 1 ff., Bhandarkar, Report 1884-1887, p. 19 f.; Th. Zachariae, Die indischen Wörterbücher, p. 27 ff. The poem has 18 sargas and has been published with a commentary in the Km. 49, 1895.

6. Published with the commentary of Śaśadhara in Km. 62. The poem has 13 sargas.

name Kavirāja[1]. His patron was Kāmadeva of the Kādamba family (1182-1197 A.D.). The poet boasts that except Bāṇa and Subandhu nobody is equal to him in the use "crooked language" (vakrokti). To the same category belongs also the Rāghavanaiṣadhīya[2] of Haradatta sūri, whose time is not definite. [The writer's father was Jayaśaṅkara and he was of the Garga-gotra]. In this epic too each stanza has two meanings, of which the one relates to Rāma and the other to Nala.

The Nala-tale has repeatedly been worked upon by poets. The most famous one is the Naiṣadhacarita[3] of the poet Śrīharṣa [son of Hīra and Māmalladevī, who wrote it probably under Vijayacandra and Jayacandra of Kanauj in the second-half of the 12 century A. D.[4]], that by the Indian literary critics

1. Kavirāja, "Prince of Poets", is a title that the Indian poets have too often assumed. We cannot trace any chronological clue from the occurrence of a kavirāja (for example in Vāmana's Kāvyālaṁkāravṛtti, 4, 1, 10). That our poet is called also Kavirājasūri or Kavirājapaṇḍita, in any case, appears to indicate that kavirāja had become a proper noun. Cf. K. B. Pathak, JBRAS 22, 1905; Bhandarkar, Report 1884-87, p. 20 and Pischel, HL, p. 37 ff.

2. Published with poet's own commentary in Km. 57, 1896. There exists also one Rāghavapāṇḍavayādavīya of Cidambara, in which each stanza permits of three interpretations, and which reproduces the stories of the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Bhāgavatapurāṇa; see Aufrecht, CC I 500; II, 117; [Madras Catalogue, XX, p, 78 29 f.; also P. P. S. Śāstrī, Tanjore Catalogue, VI, 2709. Veṅkaṭādhavariṇ's Yādavarāghavīya tells Rāma's story, but when read backward gives Kṛṣṇa's tale (Madras Cat. XX, 7956; Keith, HSL, p. 138) printed in Telugu characters, with the author's own commentary at Vidyātaranginī Press, 1890. Yet another work of the type is Pārvatīrukmiṇīya (Des. Cat. of Sans. MSS in Govt. Or. MSS. Library, Madras, Vol. XX, 7779-79, No. 11606). It handles the stories of marriages of Śiva and Pārvatī and of Kṛṣṇa and Rukmiṇī.]

3. Without any apparent reason the poem has been divided into two halves, Pūrva- and Uttara-Naiṣadhacarita (I-XI and XII-XXII). An edition of the first half by Premachandra Paṇḍita with his own commentary appeared in Calcutta 1836, an edition of the Uttara-Naiṣadhacarita with the commentary of Nārāyaṇa by E. Röer in Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1855. A complete edition with the commentary of Nārāyaṇa also in Bombay NSP. 1894, 9th ed. 1952. W. Yates, As. Researches, Vol. 20, 2nd part, Calcutta 1839, p. 318 ff. has given a good account of the book.

[Ed. Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, with Mallinātha's commentary, 2 vols, Calcutta 1875-76; ed. K. L. V. Sāstrī and others with the commentary of Mallinātha (I-XII), in two parts Palghat, 1924; ed. Nityasvarūpa Brahmacārī with commentaries of Nārāyaṇa, Bharatamallika and Vaṁśīvādana (I-III only), Calcutta 1929 30; Eng. transl. with extracts from eight commentaries (Vidyādhara, Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita Īśānadeva, Narahari, Viśveśvara, Jinarāja, Mallinātha, and Nārāyaṇa) by K. K. Handiqui, Lahore 1934. Besides one Cāritravardhana too wrote a commentary on it.]

4. Bühler, JBRAS, X, 31 ff.; XI, 279 ff.

is usually named beside the epics of the classical poets Kālidāsa, Bhāravi and Māgha as the last of the series of master works of the ornate court epic. It is a great epic in 22 cantos that narrates the story of Nala in a most eleborate style. Indeed, the strong distinction between early popular epics and ornate court epics can hardly be brought to one's mind better than when he compares the simple narration of the story of Nala and Damayantī in the Mahābhārata, that appeals and delights us even to-day through its ingenuous representations and simple but forceful language, with the poem, full of bombastic expressions, of Śrīharṣa, who strives simply for utilizing all the niceties of the Alaṁkāraśāstra for overcoming all the difficulties of prosody and also for bringing to light of the day his profound knowledge of mythology and mastery over the Kāmaśāstra. In any case, it cannot be denied that he commands mastery over language and metrics, is an adept in making up poetical game of words and that he has good many imageries in his pictures of nature.

Whilst ornate poets are mostly satisfied with applying themselves to fabrication of play-of-words for the purpose of showing off their linguistic talents Śrīharṣa knows also sometimes to apply them in places where they are regulated internally from the context. The four gods assume the form of Nala for the purpose of causing confusion in the mind of Damayantī at the time of selection of her husband. Now the poet (XIII, 3 ff.) lets Sarasvatī, who presents the courting princes to Damayantī, to introduce the five "Nalas" in stanzas, each of which has two meanings, one referring to Nala and the other to each one of the gods, who are concealed in the form of Nala. A beautiful instance is when the the poet says:— (XXII, 40)

dhvāntasya tena kriyamāṇena dviṣaḥ śaśī varṇanayātha ruṣṭaḥ ।
udyannupāloki japāruṇaśrīrnarādhipenānunayeccheva ॥

"After Nala has described the night, he brings in the description of the rising of the moon, where he says that the moon, who has become red on account of anger caused by the description in a number of stanzas of "his enemy, the

Dark[1]" outlined by Nala, and for the purpose of consoling him Nala straightway begins to praise the moon "rising in japā-beauty"[2]. But how tasteless and pedantic it is, when the poet (in canto VII) describes the beauty of Damayantī, and brings before us her eyes, to which he has devoted nine stanzas, her nose, that is described in one stanza, her lips, praised in six stanzas etc. down up to the toe, and does not spare one single member of the body! And in the 22 cantos of the epic he does not succeed in carrying the narrative up to the description of happiness of the newly married couple. The poet ends his poem in a description of the moony night in a conversation between Nala and Damayantī.

It is clear how little has the poet strived for the story itself and how very much for bringing in linguistic niceties. The following anecdote shows that there is no unanimity among the Indian critics with regard to the merit of this poem:—

When Śrīharṣa had finished his Naiṣadhacarita he showed it to his uncle Mammaṭa, the author of Kāvyaprakāśa. After the latter went through it he expressed his regret that he had not seen it earlier, since when in his poetics he wrote the chapter on the faults of poetry he had to take great pains in finding out examples from a large number of books. So had he known about the Naiṣadhacarita in right time, he would not have the necessity of going beyond this work, in which he could find an example for every type of fault[3].

Apparently in the 13th century A.D. the poet Kṛṣṇānanda not only wrote a commentary on the Naiṣadhacarita, but also

[1. The words used by W. "seines Freundes, des Dunkels", are evidently wrong for "seines Feindes, des Dunkels". Keith too commits the same error (HSL p. 141).]

[2. W. has "rosenroter Schönheit". But japā in not rose. M. Williams translates it as China-rose.]

3. Communicated by Hall, Vāsavadattā, Preface p. 55, who does not mention his source. It is one of the literary anecdotes that orally circulate among the paṇḍitas and have no historical value. Chronologically too the statement that Mammaṭa was an uncle of Śrīharṣa is not confirmed. Cf. above II, p. 54: [but the translator could not locate it either in the original or in the translation.]

retold the Nala-legend in the epic Sahṛdayānanda[1] in 15 cantos. And again in the 15th century the poet Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa, also known as "new Bāṇa" (Abhinavabhaṭṭabāṇa), worked on the same legend in his Nalābhyudaya[2].

Worthy of special mention is the Śrīkaṇṭhacarita[3] of the Kashmirian poet Maṅkha. [1135-1145 A. D.]. He handles the myth of the overthrow of Asura Tripura. The tale is, however, of secondary importance. The main goal of the poet is to describe the seasons, the sunrise, the sunset, the court entertainments etc. according to the rules of poetics. Maṅkha himself refers to Ruyyaka as his teacher[4]. Its canto XXV is of great literary historical importance. In it Maṅkha narrates, how, after he completed his poem, recited it before a number of paṇḍitas, amongst whom were also the court officials, who had assembled in the house of his brother Alaṁkāra, a minister of Jayasiṁha of Kashmir [1127-1150 A. D.]. The poet has mentioned the names of those thirty scholars, poets and officials who were living there in his court and the sciences in which they had especialised. He avails of this opportunity to present a lively picture of a sabhā, i.e. of a learned assembly, such as is held upto this day and apparently has been being held since many centuries ago. From the family-tree of the poet, that he has appended, we learn that he was one of the four brothers, all of whom were scholars, writers and officials at the same time.

To the 12th century belongs the religious epic

1. Published in Km. 32, 1892.

2. A fragment of eight cantos of this poem has been published in TSS No. 3, 1913 by Gaṇapati Śāstrī. This "New Bāṇa" (Abhinavabāṇa) is also the author of Vemabhūpālacarita, a prose-novel of the type of Harṣacarita. Vema, the hero of this epic, who wrote as Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa, lived probably in the first half of the 15th century A. D. Cf. Gaṇapati's Introduction and Suali in GSAI 26, 214.

3. Published with the commentary of Jonarāja (who lived in 1417-1467 A. D.) in Km. 3, 1887. [He is mentioned also as Maṅkhaka. See also Bühler, Kashmir Report, Extra No. of JBRAS, Bombay, 1877 p. 50-52.]

4. Ruyyaka cites Śrīkaṇṭhacarita in his Alaṁkārasarvasva. [See Jacob, JRAS, 1897, p. 293.]

[The southern tradition of Maṅkha's collaboration with Ruyyaka is not considered authentic by S. K. De, Sans. Poetics I, p. 191 ff., HSL, p. 322, Foot-note.]

Haracaritacintāmaṇi[1] of the Kashmirian poet Rājānaka Jayaratha, that is full of Śiva-legends and teachings of Śaivism. He lived in the 12th century A. D.

As a curiosity deserves to be mentioned Kathākautuka of Śrīvara (15th century)[2]. It is an ordinary epic of mediocre merit, that in 15 cantos reproduces the story of Yusuf and Zuleikha according to Dsachāmī. The story, that is rather an adaptation than a translation of the Persian poem, begins with a glorification of Mahāmad Śāhi (Muhammad Shāh, who ascended the throne in 1481), during whose reign Dsachāmī composed his poem. Sufficiently noteworthy is this amalgamation of the old Hebrew story with the Persian romantic ballad and the Indian Śiva-cult, since Śrīvara is a staunch devotee of Śiva, and canto XV is wholly devoted to glorification of Śiva.

Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita, a devout Śaiva[3], of the 17th century A.D., in his Gaṅgā vataraṇa, an epic in 8 cantos, extols the descent of the celestial river Gaṅgā into the world of man. The poetess Madhuravāṇī, who in her Rāmāyaṇasāra, once more works upon the plot of the Rāmāyaṇa, shows that even women took part in composition of ornate court poetry. She was a court-poetess of King Raghunātha of Tanjore (17th century)[4]. Two cantos of another epic, namely Rājapraśa sti of a poet Raṇacchoda, who lived towards the end of the 18th century, have inscriptionally come down to us[5].

That the court epics have continued to be written down up to the present day is demonstrated by Viśvanātha Deva

1. Published in Km. 61, 1897, the text running up to 22 prakāśas. Cf. Bühler, Report p. 61.

[The form Jayadratha, and not Jayaratha, of the name of the author occurs in the printed text and also in Buhlers report. Possibly our author was a brother of Jayaratha, who commented upon Abhinavagupta's Tantrāloka; see S. K. De, HSL, p. 323.]

2. Cf. R. Schmidt, Das Kathākautukam des Śrīvara. Verglichen mit Dschāmīs Jusuf und Zuleikha, Kiel, 1893 und Śrīvaras Kathākautukam, die Geschichte von Joseph in persisch-indischem Gewand, Sanskrit und Deutsch, Kiel 1898. Text also in Km. 72, 1901. On the Persian poem see P. Horn, Geschichte der persischen Litterature, Leipzig 1901, p. 190f. From the Persian source originates also the epic Delārāmakathāsāra of the Kashmirian poet Rājānaka Bhaṭṭa Āhlādaka, published in Km. 77, 1902, See Hertel, Jinakirtis "Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla", p. 61 ff. 135 f.

3. Published in Km. 76 1902. The poet was a son of Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita, who was a nephew of Appaya Dīkṣita.

4. M. T. Narasimhiengar, JRAS 1908, 168.

5. Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. 5, Appendix No. 321.

Śarman, the Rājā Bahadoor of Athagarh, Orissa, who personally presented to Winternitz in January 1913 a copy of his own mythological epic Rukmiṇīpariṇaya (Calcutta 1912), written in 11 cantos. The poem is provided with a commentary by his chief queen. It is a Mahākāvya that has all the characteristics prescribed in poetics and could have been written equally five centuries earlier.

Generally the history of the ornate court epic does not present a gratifying picture. It can probably be said that court environment and patronage were not conducive to the development of the epic. That the Indians were poetically gifted, that they possessed power of imagination, that they were capable of representing a great many types of human destinies, that they knew to present characters in a masterly way and that they did not lack in original ideas—all this is demonstrated with the help of popular epics, narrative literature and better pieces of dramatical writings. But above all there is nothing remarkable in ornate court epics. There the characters are almost everywhere stereotyped, since the poet does not trouble himself for inventing anything, but he adopts old epical materials with little alteration. One can just say that the Alaṁkāraśāstra has killed true poetry. The form has secured complete triumph over the subject-matter. And Oh, what a display of ingenuity and an actual tiresome brain-work is involved in these poems!

In lyrics, in gnomic poetry and in drama, as well as in the master-pieces of narrative literature too the kāvya-style holds the ground. But we shall see that here the popular origin under the influence of the court environment is not, however, completely lost to such an extent as to permit the form become so much prominent as to cause the plot get neglected as has been the case with the epics.

HISTORICAL LITERATURE[1]

In India historical literature too belongs to the class of court poetry. It is often maintained that the Indians did not have any important historical literature to their credit and that they had

1. Cf. J. F. Fleet, Int. Ant. 30, 1901, 1 ff., W. E. Windisch Geschichte der Sanskritphilologie I, S. 170 ff. (On Lassen, Ind. Altertumskunde II, 1 ff; 40 ff.).

little taste for history. It is not correct, however. That they had a taste for history is proved by the list of teachers in different Vedic texts and the genealogies in the Mahābhārata and in the purāṇas. Notwithstanding the mythical elements that dominate in them by far, the purāṇas preserve many valuable historical traditions[1].

Huen-Tsiang affirms that during the time he was here in every Indian city there were annals. Till to-day the Rajputs, Banias and Mewatis have annals that are carefully preserved by Bhāṭas[2]. The Indians have genealogical tables in a form that is unknown in the West. In any case important persons, village-chiefs and even ordinary farmers can produce a family-tree that establishes the widely branched out relationships, often going back to two or three centuries, and is of great importance for settling questions relating to inheritance. Each monastery (maṭha) carefully maintains the order of succession of its principal teachers. A taste for history is proved also by monastic historical works of the Buddhists and the Jainas, who in chronicles and biographies adhere to the life of their saints and the history of their religious communities and have handed them down historically to the extent they have been capable of[3]. Taste for history is lastly seen also in numerous inscriptions of all the centuries beginning from the time of Aśoka, that are available to us, and in any case they show that the Indians too possessed a taste for associating the present with the past and the future, and thereby they traced the history of their kings in genealogies going back to the most possible extent and that they inscribed the deeds of their patrons for information of coming generations on stone-pillars and rocks, in temples and caves and on copper plates for future ages.

1. See above I, 169, 257, 266, 319 f. 442. 449; Transl. p. 194, 309, 319, 375 f., 520, 529 : F. E. Pargiter in JRAS 1910, p. ff.

2. C. V. Vaidya, The Mahābhārata, Bombay 1905, 76 f. In western India there are still court-singers, who recite the praśastipaṭṭas (the panegyric annals) before family circles. Cf. Shankar Pandit, Gaüḍavaho, p. CLXIX note.

3. See above II, 167 ff.; 331 f.; Transl. p. 208 ff.; 509 f. "Geschichte des Buddhismus" of Tibetan Tārānātha too rests on Indian sources. He himself mentions a work, written in 2000 ślokas, of Paṇḍita Kṣemendrabhadra of Magadha, in addition to another work Buddhapurāṇa of Indradatta, besides an old biography of ācāryas, the work written by Brāhmaṇa Bhaṭaghaṭī, as the basis of his own work (Tārānātha, Geschichte des Buddhismus ... translated into German by A. Schiefner, p.281). Historical documents are also the Paṭṭāvalis, the list of Jaina patriarchs, see above II, 331, transl. p. 509; and also Bhandarkar, Report 1883-1884, 14 f., 319 ff.

It is true, as Winternitz holds, that in India there has been no Herodotus or likewise a hero such as Livy or Tacitus. What the Indians lacked in was not, however, taste for history, but taste for criticism and for historical truth. And reason of this is that the writers of history were generally either court-poets or religious-minded persons. For the former the main duty was to sing in praise of their princes, to record their and their ancestors' heroic deeds and probably also to invent such ones as never took place. The divine were above all busy either with praise of their sect or in preaching to the community and to cause it to increase.

The Indian historical writing was always just a branch of poetry. Chronicles, in which myths and history appear strongly amalgamated, or biographical and historical epics and novels or also poems written in praise of kings are mixed up with historical or semi-historical topics. The Indian historian pursues a course that is altogether different from the one followed by the Greek or the Roman. He will not go deep into the circumstances, set historical facts critically and explain them psychologically; he will entertain and instruct as a poet (kavi), above all teach morals, when he will explain with examples the influences of moral behaviour on the destiny of man[1]. All the "Indian historical works", as sources of history, thereore, should be used only with extreme caution. The story told by a court-fool to a Tartar Khān mostly holds good in their case:—the Khān wanted his historian to write down a book on his life and works and wanted to name it as "Thousand and one Truth", to which the court-fool retorted by saying that the more correct title would be "Thousand and one Tales". This too is a fact that the Indian could not write history without beginning from its commencement. For the purpose of getting upto the history of their own age, the authors of the purāṇas begin with the origin of the world, the Buddhist monks with the first Buddha, who is believed to have lived billions of years ago, and the authors of recent historical epics, with the heroes of the Mahābhārata or with gods or demigods, from which earthly kings derive their origin. Consequently the admixture of tales and history, that is greater according as the author goes back to an earlier period and is less accord-

1. Cf. Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī, Trans. I, p. 35 ff.

ing as he approaches his own age. Thence it is very much possible that the historian, who knows nothing about the earliest time but to narrate myths and tales, may be entirely dependable for his own and immediately preceding ages.

The p r a ś a s t i s, i.e. panegyric poems, too, that have come down to us in inscriptions, are not only historical documents, but are often more or less full-fledged ornate poems, written usually in elaborate metres, and now and then in literary prose too. There are poems composed in accordance with the desire of princes or rich men. They contain information by professional poets (including those who are famous in literature) regarding dedication of temples or other religious or temporal monuments. After a benediction follows usually the genealogy and panegyric description of the donor and the ruling prince, in case the latter is not himself the donor, a description of the monument, of its aim and of the benefit associated with the gift, privileges etc. and at the end is an expression of the wish relative to conservation of the monument, adjuration against possible mischievous person or devastator, a note about the chief builder, who built it, on the priest, who consecrated it, about the poet and about the scribe of the inscription and lastly, unfortunately not always accurate, a statement of the date. By the side of praśastis of 10-12 stanzas there are long poems of hundred or more verses[1]. The importance that these inscriptions have for the history of ornate court poetry has already been shown above. Among the inscriptions of the Gupta princes and numerous other praśastis there are found, beside productions of inferior value, many poems, that, measured according to the Indian standard, must be considered as pieces of epic poetry of the first rate. There are two long praśastis that were composed by an insignificant poet R ā m a in between 700 and 800 A.D. The fact that he calls himself "prince of poets" (kavīśvara) and says about himself that he composed this hymn of praise when he was young and boasts that the goddess Sarasvatī came to live in his mouth-lotus even before he had forgotten the taste of his mother's milk will prove little. More important it is that a first rate scholar like B ü h l e r, the editor and publisher of the inscription[2], describes him as a poet of much talent and learning. He has for example composed a stotra in 14 stanzas, in which

1. Cf. B ü h l e r, WZKM 2, 1888, 86 ff.
2. Ep. Ind. 1, 97 ff.

each one can be interpreted in a manner that it will be applicable to both Śiva and his spouse Gaurī at the same time. Rare words and forms go to prove that he had assiduously studied grammar and lexicon. Another full-fledged poetical inscription is that of Lalitasuradeva of the 9th century A. D.[1].

One of the earliest historical epics is the Prākritkāvya Gaüḍavaha[2] of Vākpatirāja, the chief poet in the court of King Yaśovarman of Kanauj. It was apparently written after the death of the king in about 750 A.D. The work is more a panegyric rather than a historical poem, although it was written to celebrate the slay of a Gauḍa prince by the poet's patron, who was himself overthrown and killed not much later (c. 740 A.D.) by Lalitāditya of Kashmir. It contains full necessary information regarding military exploits of warriors and is replete with so many pictures of landscapes, descriptions of seasons, royal relationships etc. interwoven with mythical narrations. Vākpatirāja is more original than Sanskrit poets, inasmuch as he describes also scenes from rural life that do not occur elsewhere. He keeps himself aloof from play on words and puns. On the contrary long compounds are not seldom. But the text that is available to us is probably just an extract from the original work, from which pure historical data were excluded outright for the purpose of retaining only the "pearls" of poetry, the poetical descriptions etc.[3].

An epic, of which its real theme is fabulous, but refers to historical names and events, and hence deserves to be mentioned as an historical work in the true sense is the Navasāhasāṅkacarita[4] of Padmagupta or Parimala. The poem has 18

1. Ind. Ant. 25, 1896, 177 ff. A great collection of poetical inscriptions, of which a major part consists of records of gifts of land, is included in the Prācīnalekhamālā, published in Km. 34, 1892; 64, 1897; 80, 1903.

2. Edited by Shankar P. Pandit, BSS No. 34, 1887. Cf. Bühler, WZKM 1, 1887, 324 ff. 2, 1888, 328 ff.; cf. Smith, JRAS 1908, pp. 765-78. The commentary of Haripāla is almost a Sanskrit rendering from Prākrit. [In the opinion of Keith (HSL, p. 150) Hertel's views (Asia Major 1) on Bhavabhūti and Vākpati carry no conviction.]

3. That is the more probable assumption of Jacobi, GGA, 1888, 61 ff. Shankara Pandit believes that the text that we have may just be a torso that constituted merely the introduction to the proper work.

4. Published by V. S. Islāmpurkar, BSS No. 53, 1895, Cf. G. Bühler and Th. Zachariae, Ueber das the Navasāhasāṅkadevacarita of Padmagupta or Parimala in SWA 1888. The work has been cited by Ruyyaka. [An account of the Paramāra dynasty is given in the poem in X, 64-102; See Bühler and Zachariae, Reprint p. 24.]

cantos and relates the mythical theme of the winning the princess Śaśiprabhā, daughter of the Nāga king. It is written by the poet for the purpose of glorification of his patron, the king Sindhurāja Navasāhasaṅka of Mālva. The Indian court poets, of course, often have the tendency to "change the historical events of the most recent past into myths"[1] on purely poetical grounds. So in this work too an historical essence remains in narration of the myth. The poem my have been written in about 1005 A.D.[2].

Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita[3] is the history of the Cālukya princes. It begins with a myth about the origin of the dynasty of this king. In it God Śiva appears always when the king has done anything that is not strictly moral. Here the king has a fairy (Vidyādharī) as his bride. This work too goes to show that poets in India have had always the fancy for dressing even historical events in mythical garbs. The book narrates the history of the princes of the Cālukya dynasty of Kalyāṇa Someśvara I, Someśvara II, and particularly of Vikramāditya VI, who ruled from 1076 to 1127 A. D. The chief objective of Bilhaṇa, however, is to show his skill as a poet, to follow all the rules of poetics and to extol his heroes exuberantly. Although the events narrated by him are historical, as is proved by many Cālukya inscriptions, we get here a distorted picture, since he always exaggerates. Thus he assures us that in each and every campaign of the Cālukyas against the Colas the latter were completely annihilated, although very soon we are told by him that fresh movements of the erstwhile enemies made a more extensive campaign necessary. Even the duration of time that intervened between the different events is not stated accurately, and the poet always says 'after some time', 'after many days', etc. The historian gives place to the poet. Thus for example, Bilhaṇa tells us that when this king was born flowers fell from the heaven, Indra's drum was sounded and gods in the

1. Buhler and Zachariae ibide p. 48 f. Such mythologising representation we find even in inscriptions.

2. Cf. Bühler, EP. Ind. 1, 222 ff. 232; Duff 100; Peterson, Śubh. 51 ff.

3. Published by G. Bühler, BSS Nr. 14, 1875. The German translation of A. Haack (printed in 1897 at Ratibor, but was not available in a bookshop) not was known to W. Cf. A. V. V. Ayyar, Ind. Ant. XLVIII, 114 H., 133 ff. [Editions also by M. L. Nagar, 1934 and V. S. Bhāradvāja, both printed at Vārāṇasī]

heaven became happy,—but nonetheless he does not tell us the date of his birth.

As an epic poet, he tarries when he finds an occasion to describe any event. So he devotes three cantos to the marriage of Vikrama with Candralekhā and describes the beauty of the bride in detail. In the description of the ceremony of selection of her husband by the bride (svyaṁvara) he has followed the Raghuvaṁśa of Kālidāsa as his model. One of the most beautiful and attractive places in the poem is the narration of the death of Āhavamalla, father of Vikrama in canto IV[1].

In canto XVIII the poet gives his autobiography. Here he describes his native land, particularly his native village Khonamukha, in a manner so true to nature that Bühler[2], who visited the place, has expressed his admiration at the exactness of the description. The village clings so closely to the hills of the Himālaya that it could not have been described more accurately than in the words of the poet, who has designated it as "a coquettish ornament of the Himālaya". About his father Jyeṣṭhakalasa he reports that he wrote a commentary on the Mahābhaṣya. Both of his brothers were scholars and authors. About his ownself he boasts that he had ardently and diligently studied the Vedas, the Vedāṅgas, grammar upto the Mahābhāṣya and poetics and that the fame of his poetry had spread all over the world. He says not altogether unassumingly "there is no village, no province, no capital town, no forest and no grove, or place that Sarasvatī has sanctified, where the wise and the fool, the old and the young, man and woman do not in a body recite his poem with a thrill of joy" (XVIII, 89). He had travelled far and wide, in the same manner as young scholars and poets in India have the tendency to do, in different courts and places of pilgrimage. He visited the holy cities of Mathurā, Kanauj, Allahabad and Vārāṇasī. For a long time he stayed with a prince Karṇa of Ḍāhala, where he defeated the poet Gaṅgādhara in a literary

1. A metrical English rendering of this passage is given in the Ind. Ant. 5, 1876, 324 ff.

2. Report 5f.

contest and composed a poem on Rāma. After travelling much he arrived at Kalyāṇa, where King Vikramāditya conferred on him the title Vidyāpati ("Master of Science") and presented to him one blue umberella and an elephant.

High as a tower, Rājataraṅgiṇī[1], "the River of Kings" stands above all other similar productions of Indian literature, equally as a work of history and of poetical composition. In other words it is the history of the kings of Kashmir of the poet Kalhaṇa[2]. Kalhaṇa was the son of the minister Caṇpaka, who played not an unimportant rôle in the court of King Harṣa (1089-1101). He was probably born towards the beginning of the 12th century A.D. and completed his work in the year 1148. As a Brāhmaṇa by birth he acquired a basic literary culture. He was very well read, especially in the Mahābhārata, and had studied also Bāṇa's Harṣacarita, Bilhaṇa's Vikramāṅkadevacarita and works like Varāhamihira's Bṛhatsaṁhitā. He manifests his literary taste on each occasion. By religion he was a devotee of Śiva. He admires with predilection the kings with Śivaite disposition and whenever, about any of his patrons he says that he was a devotee of Śiva, he often uses such an expression in the same sense in which an English man uses the word "Christian", when he refers to some respectable person. Still he has much sympathy

1. The first critical edition we owe to M.A. Stein (Bombay 1892), from whom we have also a complete English translation with valuable annextures (Introduction, Notes, Appendices) which have brought the importance of the work for history, geography and ethnography of Kashmir, into the correct clear light (Westminster 1900, 2 vols.). Cf. Winternitz, WZKM 16, 1902, 405 ff.; Oldenberg, Aus dem alten Indien, Berlin 1910, 81 ff., Marie Von Bunsen in "Nord und Sud" 1915, 327 ff. On Kalhaṇa's importance as an historian see Bühler, Report 52 ff.; LXVI ff., where the earlier writings of N. H. Wilson, A. Cunningham, Ch. Lassen, and A. Troyer have been evaluated and Shankar Pandit, Gauḍavaho, Introd, p. CLXI ff. E. Hultzsch, Ind. Ant. 18, 1889, 65 ff., 97 ff. gives extracts with translation from book I and in Ind. Ant. 40, 1911, 97 ff.; 42, 1913, 301 ff. and ZDMG 69, 1915, 129 ff. he has made contribution towards its textual criticism. Stein's edition has superceded all other editions, including the one of Durgāprasāda BSS No. 35, 51, 54; [vol. (I-VII), vol. 2 (VIII), vol. 3 (Supplements of Jonarāja, Śrīvara and Prājyabhaṭṭa, 1892, 1894, 1896. The *editio princeps* with three supplements was published by the Asiatic Society of the Bengal, Calcutta, 1835.]

2. We know Kalhaṇa only as the author of the Rājataraṅgiṇī. A kāvya Jayasiṁhābhyudaya too is attributed to him: see Peterson, OC VI Leiden 1883, III, 2, 361: [the reference is to Ratnākara's citation in his Sārasamuccaya. The sanskrit form of this name is Kalyāṇa, by which name he is mentioned in Maṅkha's Śrīkaṇṭhacarita XXV, 80 ff. Cf. A. Stein, Rājatar., transl. p. 12 f.]

for Buddhism. He praises Aśoka and other kings for their establishment of monasteries and erection of stūpas, exhibits a good knowledge of Buddhist teachings and refers in a respectful manner to Jinas and to Bodhisattvas. But that does not deter him from jeering at the "monk nuisance" brought to an end by King Candradeva (I, 184). He was a highly cultured and independently thinking person. Although he was brought up in court-environment, he was neither a courtier nor a court-poet. He had a critical independent view about characters. Many severely biting words are uttered in reference to Brāhmaṇas, as also against officials. Strict in his principles, he often uses severe words for censure He speaks with greater contempt about Ḍāmaras, a class of gentry or "younker" whom he does not consider better than "robbers" (dasyu).

Kalhaṇa specifically says in the beginning of his work that it is the work of the poet to write history : (I, 4)

konyaḥ kālamatikrāntaṁ netuṁ pratyakṣatāṁkṣamaḥ ।
kaviprajāpatiṁstyaktvā ramyanirmāṇaśālinaḥ ॥

"Like Prajāpati, capable to bring forth lovely creation: who else other than a poet can place the past before the eyes of men."

To this he adds (I, 7)

ślāghyaḥ sa eva guṇavānrāgadveṣabahiṣkṛtāḥ ।
bhūtārthakathane yasya stheyasyeva sarasvatī ॥

"The noble-minded (poet) is alone worthy of praise, whose word, like that of a judge, keeps free from love or hatred in relating the facts of the past".

In fact Kalhaṇa's statement, when he too perhaps is not always wholly impartial, throughout creates the impression that he endeavours to describe not only the long past times, but also the events of his own and near-by ages *sine ira et studio*, and his opinion is mostly inspired by high moral cosmic philosophy. Throughout in his narrative the poet inserts moral maxims. For him the real objective of writing history consists in teaching of dharma and morality. To him, as to any Indian, that success and failure of present life have their cause in the good and evil acts (karman) of the previous existence is an incontestable fact. He is wholly in keeping with the common Indian opinion to the extent that he believes in magic and witchcraft. When he speaks about the kings, who are ruined, either on account of

witchcraft or due to the curse of a Brāhmaṇa, he does it with the same conviction with which he would narrate that they perished either with sword or on account of poison. He is Indian in this respect as well that his chronology of earlier ages is often improbable. He makes King Raṇāditya rule for 300 years — a thing that is not credible. If we are to fix the date of Aśoka according to Kalhaṇa, we shall have to set it at 1260 B.C.[1]. With true Indian credulity he narrates all myths and legends that he found for earlier ages in his sources and in traditions, so all the wonderful snake-legends, that are associated with the earliest history of Kashmir.

On the other hand, however, he has not utilized the literary sources, without first examining them critically. He is not content merely with the study of earlier works on Kashmir, but he has made use of inscriptions, genealogical tables and memoires of important personalities, examined coins and monuments and has interested himself in folk-lore, proverbs and legends. In short, he was an accurate investigator into antiquities. By general admission Kalhaṇa is a trustworthy guide for the history of his own age and for that of a little former times.

The poet Kalhaṇa is a master of the art of presentation. He knows to delineate the sketch of a person drawn from his actual life and does not follow merely any set pattern or type. In this respect he stands apart from other Indian poets.

> How lively stand before us the personalities such as the cruel and vicious, but cunning and energetic queen Diddā (VI, 176 ff.) or the good-natured weak Ananta (VII, 142) ? With much humour and biting sarcasm he describes the people of the lower society who attain high offices and powers from insignificant positions in life without any special merit. One such character, for example, is Kāyastha Bhadreśvara, who at first was a market-gardener,

1. Cf. Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī Transl. 1, p. 53 f; Fleet, Ind. Ant. 30, 11f., 14. It is significant that many pandits in India still understand by the term "history" an essay entitled "History of Kashmir" of Pandit Anand Koul in the JASB 6, 1910, 195 ff., where the "History of Kashmir" under 47 sovereigns based of the Nīlamatapurāṇa [ed. Ramalal Kanjilal and Jagaddhar Zadoo, Lahore 1924 ; ed. K. St. J. M. de Vreese, Leiden (Brill), 1936] and the Rājataraṅgiṇi is presented with such "accurate" dates as: Gonanda I 3120-3103 B.C., Dāmodara I 3103-3090 B.C. etc. down up to Bhagavant 1459-1445 B.C.

butcher and fuel-seller; for living he had hung at the back of officials, carrying their bags and ink-bottles, while with a rough woollen cloth he rubbed his (own) back, till Tuṅga, the prime minister of Queen Diddā, made him his assistant, and who later himself became the prime minister (VII, 38 ff., 106).

Kalhaṇa shows himself as a pioneer poet also in many episodes, descriptions, sketches and comparisons. Thus for example we may read his presentation of the tragic end of King Yudhiṣṭhira I at the end of the book I : "like a vulture on a carcass" did the violent enemies fall upon the empire of the weakly king. He was compelled to leave his own country, while his enemies carried away his wives and treasures "just as the tree which falls from the top of a high mountain is stripped quickly by boulders of its creepers, fruits and the rest" (I, 368). We may read also the description of a famine, that occurred as a consequence of heavy snowfall, that he compares to the "grim laughter of the Death" (II, 19), or the story of the wonderful and horrible restoration to life of Sandhimati by the witches (II, 82 ff.).

It is, however, particularly the realistic descriptions of books VII and VIII that present to us Kalhaṇa as a true poet. Impressive is the description of the tragic death of Sūryamatī (VII, 472 ff.). This prominent lady was the wife of King Ananta. She had taken under her control the weak king and the reins of administration, so much so that she compelled him even to forego the throne in favour of her son Kalaśa. This had had an evil consequence and led the father and the son to strife and conflict. Several times cunning Suryamatī succeeded in bringing about temporary peace. But after a short reconciliation Kalaśa stepped into open enemity against his father, whose position now became wholly untenable. One day there took place a violent scene between Ananta and his wife : he rebuked her bitterly and even expressed his doubt regarding Kalaśa being his legitimate son. The insulted lady got offended and she overwhelmed him with abuses. Then the deeply hurt king again went into despair and committed suicide. Suryamatī, however, then decided to follow him

unto death as a satī. Then in a solemn manner she cursed each one of them who had ruined them and had caused dissension among them: then with an oath she proved herself above suspicion in the matter of being faithful to her husband and burnt herself with smiling eyes in the flames of the funeral pile, and (VII, 479).

ajāyata nabhovahnijvālāvalayamālitam ।
tadāgamotsave dattasindūramiva nirjaraiḥ ॥

"The sky became encircled (and reddened) with sheets of flames, just as if gods, in order to celeberate her arrival, had covered (it) with minium".

Actually the master-pieces of character-painting are the portraits of King Harṣa (VII, 869 ff) and King Sussala (VIII, 482 ff.) designed by Kalhaṇa. The same poet shows the style of the Rāmāyaṇa or that of the Mahābhārata in his story of King Harṣa, as he narrates it in book VII. Even the appearance of this monarch is impressive. Usually he shows himself like a contended lion with his long beard in disorder and moustaches hanging about his face; his shoulders are like those of a bull; he has a wide breast and he speaks with a thundering voice. Even gods would lose their presence of mind before him. But his character is full of contradictions. He is a model of justice. Big bells are hanging in all the four directions of his palace, that can be rung by anybody who has something to request for[1]. He is always very liberal, rewards his servants richly and beggars get resettled by his gifts and they become capable of maintaining others.

He and his wife visit monasteries and temples. Bands of poets and learned men, including among others the poet Bilhaṇa, live in his court. Harṣa himself is highly gifted, expert in several languages, a high class singer and poet[2].

1. VII, 879. Cf. above II, 172f. Transl. p. II, 215. [Cf. also V. R. R. Dikshitar, ABOR I, 15, p. 218 ff.]

2. The relevant words are --

prasannasiṁhavipreksī nīcaśmaśrucchaṭāñcitaḥ ।
vṛṣaskandho mahābāhuḥ śyāmalohitavigrahaḥ ॥ (VII, 877)
vyūḍhavakṣo kṣāmamadhyo meghaghoṣagabhīravāk । (VII, 878)

But the same Harṣa is cruel and tyrannical. In course of time he falls more under the influence of his wicked advisors in this respect. A complete train of his relations falls victim to his murderous design. A kind of Caesar's madness develops in him. He oppresses his subjects as if it be his vocation (*nitykṛtyopamam*).

In VII, 1204:—

alpāpakāramapi pārśvagataṁ nihanti
nīco na dūrasamāgasamapyarātim ।
śvā nirdiśatyupalamantikamāpatantaṁ
tattyāginaṁ na tu vidūragamugraroṣaḥ ॥

"A low minded person strikes down him who is close by even for a small fault, but not the enemy afar off, who has committed an enormous offence. (Thus too) a dog in mighty fury bites the stone which hits, but not the person who has thrown it from a distance". He plundered the treasures of temples and appointed one of his own officials as "supervisor of temple-destruction". After he had done away with all his relations he himself put into the altar the ranks of the other people. His army deserted him and the king wandered about and was obliged to seek shelter in the

somānuṣāṇāmapi yatpratibhābhaṅgakāryabhūt ॥
siṁhadvāre mahāghaṇṭāścaturdiśamabandhayat ।
jñātuṁ vijñaptikāmān prāptāṁstadvādyasaṁjñayā ॥ (VII, 879)

anyopajīvyatvaṁ prāptustasyārthitvena mārgaṇāḥ । (VII, 932)

vaktuṁ nāstyeva sāmarthyaṁ vyaktaṁ vācaspaterapi
gītamākarṇya tedyāpi tasya vāggeyakāriṇaḥ ।
vipakṣairapi pakṣmāgraluṭhadbāṣpodabindubhiḥ ॥ (VII, 942)

The passages have been translated as:—

"He used to look around like a pleased lion; his bushy beard was hanging down low; his shoulders were like those of a bull, his arms great, and his body of a dark reddish complexion; he had a broad chest with a narrow waist, and his voice was deep like thunder. Thus even super-human beings would have lost (before him) their presence of mind.

At the palace-gate (siṁhadvāra) he hung up big bells in all four directions, to be informed by their sound of those who had come with desire of making representations. ....by addressing their prayers to him. . .beggars became able to support others. . . .clearly even the Lord of speech does not have the ability to speak. . .

"Even to this day if one of the songs which he composed for the voice is heard tears roll on the eye-lashes even of his enemies".

houses of his ministers but none of them offered him any accommodation. At last he is detected in the hut of a beggar; the soldiers surround and kill him. The poet says that nobody has had enjoyed so much of power and met such a shameful end (VII, 1713.). But later, after he has described the end of Sussala, he says in a wrathful humour (VIII, 1331):—

tāṁstān kāpuruṣān harṣadevodantātprabhṛtyalam ।
smṛtyā ca kīrtayitvā ca kṛtabhāragrahā iva ॥
jātaduṣkṛtasaṁsparśāḥ khedātkartuṁ na śaknumaḥ ॥
pāpātpāpīyasāṁ yeṣām nāmagrahaṇasāhasam ॥

"By recording and describing rogues of various sorts in plenty from King Harṣa's story onwards, we have become hardened like load-carriers. Yet we cannot venture to name those persons who participated in the murder of Sussala, who were worse than wicked, owing to the pain which is caused by touching upon their evil deeds."

Extraordinarily valuable is Rājataraṅgiṇī as a cultural historical source. The descriptions that are true to life and those that have been, in at least the last two books, taken from the actual life of Kalhaṇa permit us to get an insight into Indian cultural conditions of the 11th and 12th centuries, as few works of the Indian literature do. The work is an extraordinarily rich source of information, especially for a knowledge of the religious conditions, the nature of the sects, Kashmirian popular faiths, the snake-cult, burning of widows, etc. We learn from him about law, administration, affairs of the officials, etc. too[1].

The great work of Kalhaṇa was continued in the 15th and the 16th centuries by chroniclers. Jonarāja wrote one Rājataraṅgiṇī that extends the history of the Kashmirian princes down upto the reign of Sultān Zainu-l-'ābidīn [1417-67 A.D.]. The author died in 1459 A.D. before completion of the work. His disciple Śrīvara wrote the Jaina-Rājataraṅgiṇī, which, in four chapters, contains an account of the years beginning from 1459 upto 1486 A.D. Śrīvara has slavishly imitated Kalhaṇa. Both of the works stand in every respect deep

1. Cf. Jolly in Gurupūjākaumudi, p. 84 ff., Winternitz, WZKM 16, 1902, 411 ff. and "Die Frau in den indischen Religionen" (Archiv für Frauenkunde III, 1917, Special offprint, Leipzig 1920), p. 66 ff. [On the sources of Kalhaṇa's information, see S. K. De, HSL, p. 355.]

below their model. Deeper below stands the Rājāvalipatākā, that was begun by Prājyabhaṭṭa and was completed by his desciple Śuka after Kashmir was annexed by Emperor Akbar in 1586 A.D.[1].

Other historical or half-historical works deserve to be mentioned briefly. In the first half of the 12th century Jalhaṇa, [metioned by Maṅkhaka (XXV, 75)], in his poem Somapālavilāsa has described the life of King Somapāla of Rājapurī near Kashmir who had fought against Sussala, the Kashmirian prince[2]. Towards the close of the 12th century A.D. was written the historical poem Pṛthvīrājavijaya[3] that describes the seize of Ajmīr and Ḍilhī by Cāhumāna King Pṛthvīrāja, who died in 1193 A.D. [The work that is not complete] may have been written between 1178 and 1200 A.D. and was popular in the 14th and 15th centuries[4]. In his epic poem Kumārapālacarita, called also Dvyāśrayakāvya[5], that is written partly in Sanskrit and partly in Prākrit, the learned Jaina monk Hemacandra proves himself simultaneously a poet, "historian" and grammarian in the two languages. The poem has 20 cantos in Sanskrit and 8 cantos in Prākrit. The first seven cantos are to serve as illustrations to the rules of the first seven sections of his Sanskrit grammar, whilst the eighth canto stands in a similar relation to the author's grammar of Prākrit. The work contains a history of the Caulukyas of Aṇhilvāḍ [Aṇahiḷḷapura] and particularly of Kumārapāla. In cantos XVI to XX, that are devoted to the latter, this prince is extolled above

1. These chronicles have been published with the Edition princeps of Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī, Calcutta 1835, Cf. Bühler, Report 61; Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī Transl. Vol. II, p. 373 f. [S. K. De, HSL, p. 359.]

2. Rājatar. VIII, 621 ff. Jalhaṇa has been referred to by Maṅkha as a member of the sabhā of his brother Alaṁkāra (see above, p. 86). [Cf. Krishnamacharya p. 44.]

[3. Ed. S. K. Belvalkar, Calcutta 1914-22. The editor thinks that its author was one Jayānaka Jayaratha (1st quarter of the 13th century A. D.). In V. 50 he has been cited. Recent edition of the work has been brought out G. H. Ojha and S. C. Guleri (Ajmer 1941) with the commentary of Jonarāja].

4. Cf. Bühler, Report 62 ff.; J. Morison, WZKM 7, 1893, 188 ff.; Har Bilas Sarda, JRAS 1913, 259 ff. There is only one MS. of the work, in which the name of the author does not occur. Jonarāja wrote a commentary on this work in the 15th century.

[5. The Prākṛtadvyāśrayakāvya with the commentary of Pūrṇakalaśagaṇi editied by S. P. Pandit, BSS. 60, 1900: the Sanskrit Dvyāśrayakāvya; 5th ed. by A. V. Kathavate, BSS 69, 1915 and 76, 1921 with the commentary of Abhayatilakagaṇi.]

all as a pious Jaina, who prohibited bloody sacrifices and trading in flesh, got errected Jaina temples etc. The last two cantos contain moral and religious reflections. From the concluding portion of the work it is evident that Kumārapāla was full in life and at the peak of his fame when the poem was written. Hence it could not have been written before 1163 A.D.[1].

The Kīrtikaumudī[2], a biography of Vastupāla, minister of the Vāghelā kings Lavaṇaprasāda and Vīradhavala, written by Someśvaradeva, who lived between 1179 and 1262 A.D., covers the history of the Vāghelā dynasty of Gujarat. The poet, who refers to himself as the chief priest of the king of Gujarat, is also the author of many inscriptions that are dated 1241 and 1255 A.D. One of these inscriptions contains a stanza from Kīrtikaumudī. Although the work is simply a panegyric of a liberal minister, who had literary interest, it is not devoid of poetical worth and brings to our knowledge the history of the Caulukyas[3]. It throws much side-light on the life of eminent Indians of the 13th century. Someśvaradeva is the author also of the romantic epic Surathotsava[4] in 15 cantos. Though the plot of the poem is fictitious it has perhaps a historical background. In the last canto the poet gives the history of his family, as is usual in historical and romantic epics, and concludes it with stanzas written in praise of Vastupāla. To the same minister Vastupāla, who was a pious Jaina, is connected somewhat younger but written in the same 13th century, Sukṛtasaṁkīrtana of Arisiṁha[5]. This "Praise

1. Bürgess, Ind. Ant. 4, 1875, 71 ff., 110ff., 232ff., 265 ff. gives extracts from the Sanskrit poem. Cf. Bühler, Hemacandra, p. 18 f., 43.

[There is another Kumārapālacarita by Jinasiṁhasūri, composed in 1265 A.D. (ed. Hiralal Hamsarāj, Jamnagar; yet another Kumārapālacarita by Cāritrasundara, Bhavanagar 1914. Cf. S. K. De HSL. p. 362. See the same on other works of Kumārapāla.]

2. Published by A. V. Kathavate, BSS No. 25, 1883. The German transl: by A. Haack, Kīrttikaumudī, der Mondschein des Ruhmes, (printed and published by R. Müntzberg, Ratibor 1892) is not to be found in the market.

3. Cf. Bühler. Ind. Ant. 6, 1877, 186 ff., Ep. Ind. 1, 20 ff.

4. Published in Km. 73, 1902.

5. Cf. G Bühler, Das Ṣukṛtasaṁkīrtana des Arisiṁha, SWA 1889. [Ed. Jaina Ātmānanda Sabhā Series, Bhavnagar 1917. See also S. K. De, Sanskrit Poetics, I, p. 210 f.]

of the Noble Acts" is an epic in 11 cantos, evidently of mediocre merit, but not an unimportant poem for the history of Gujarat.

There exists one Vastupālacarita written on the life of Vastupāla by Jinaharṣa. Vastupāla has been presented here as a statesman, warrior, philanthropist, constructor of temples, protector of poets and poet. He got established a big library in which he collected the largest possible number of literary works. Stanzas written by him are cited in anthologies. His great epic (mahākāvya) Naranārāyaṇānanda[1] describes the friendship of Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa and abduction of Subhadrā by Arjuna. It was written in between 1220 and 1230 A.D.

[The epic Vasantavilāsa mahākāvya of Bālacandrasūri[2] makes a mention of the death of Vastupāla. The poet who is his contemporary describes his battles and his pilgrimages as well as his generosity.]

The historical epics are not always dedicated to rulers or ministers. Such one is the Jagaḍūcarita of Sarvānanda, the biography of a simple merchant who did much for his native town in Gujarat when he got the walls of the city built anew and during the terrible famine of the years 1256-1258 he worked much for mitigation of the trouble. Although the work has only seven cantos, it is called a "great epic" (mahākāvya) and shows the same deficiency in the matter of language, poetics and metrics, as other Sanskrit poems of Jaina monks of later centuries do. The author may have lived 80 to 100 years after the events of the second half of the 14th century described by him. The wealthy merchant Jagaḍū is above all an ideal Jaina layman and is extolled as such. In the history of this merchant wonderful stories and legends have been interlaced exactly in the same manner as would have been done with respect to some king or saint. In any case, however, we find in the work a nucleus of history, as has been shown by Bühler[3].

[In the second half of the same 14th century the poetess Gaṅgādevī wrote the historical epic Madhurāvi-

[1. GOS II. 1916.]

[2. Ed. C D. Dalal in GOS, 7, 1917. On Bālacandra, see above II, trans. p. 547, 548, 591.]

3. Indian Studies I, the Jagaḍūcharita of Sarvānanda, a historical romance from Gujarāt, SWA 1892.

jaya also called Vīrakamparāyacarita[1]. The writer was the queen of Kampaṇa of Kanjeeveram (c. 1367 A.D.) and she has described in it the historic deeds of her husband; including his march against King Campa of Kāñcī and against the Muhammadan ruler of Madurārājya.]

The historical poem Hammīrakāvya of Jaina Nayacandra was written in the 15th century. In it the poet has described the heroic acts of Hammīra, who was killed in his battle against the Muhammadans. The poem breathes severe hatred for the Muhammadans, whilst it describes the tragic death of Hammīra. Before he met his heroic end, his wives and daughters burnt themselves[2].

[An historical epic of the 16th cetury is the Rāṣṭrauḍhavaṁśakāvya of Rudrakavi (published in the Gaekwad's Oriental series, No. V, 1917). In 20 cantos it narrates the history of Bāgulas of Mayūragiri from the beginning of the Rāṣṭrauḍha dynasty down upto Nārāyaṇashah, the patron of the poet.]

The panegyric poem of King Bhāvasiṁha, a contemporary of Emperor Akbar, is the Bhāvavilāsa[3] of Nyāyavācaspati Rudra. To the "historical poems" belong lastly also the biographies, like Rasikamaraṇa, an epic in 18 cantos written by Raghunātha in the 16th century, in which the life and activity of the Vaiṣṇava teacher Durvāsas are praised[4].

The number of historical poems that we have is comparatively small. But it cannot be said that because more such works

[1. Ed. Harihara Śāstrī and Śrīnivāsa Śāstrī Trivendrum, 1916.]

2. Cf. N. J. Kirtane, Ind. Ant., 8, 1879, 55 ff. [and also Bombay 1879.]

3. Published in Km., Part II, 1886, 111-126. This very Rudra is also the author of one Bhramaradūta [cf. Haraprasad Śastrī, JASB 6. 1910, 31 ff.]

4. Cf. Aufrecht, Bodl. Cat. I, 148 ff. [We may here make a mention of Vīrabhānūdayakāvya, a poem in 12 cantos, containing historical dates of Rewa of the Moghul period, of Mādhava (cf. Hīrānanda Śāstrī in the Mem. of the Arch. Soc. of Ind., No. 21), and Raghunāthābhyudaya (ed. T. R. Chintamani, Madras 1934), a poem in 12 cantos of the poetess Rāmabhadrāmba, in which certain incidents from the life of Raghunātha of Tanjore are described and which was written in the 17th century A.D.

are not available to us probably they did not exist at all. On the other hand, the fact is that interest for old myths and heroic tales has always been greater than for temporal lords, and, therefore, such works particularly when a dynasty became extinct, were no more copied.

The epics were probably most suitable for glorification of the activities of the patrons. Yet there are several chronicles that have been written in prose[1]. A modern prose work of this type is the K ṣ i t ī ś a v a ṁ ś ā v a l i c a r i t a [2], in which the history of the ancestors of King Kṛṣṇacandra of Navadvīpa in Bengal, his battles with the Muhammadans and the fate of the individual rulers, including also all sorts of court stories, anecdotes and even fabulous stories of miracles have been narrated. This chronicle, apparently written in the middle of the 18th century A.D., reaches upto the year 1728, that is the year of accession to the throne of Kṛṣṇacandra, but breaks so abruptly that it is hardly complete. The work is written in simple prose, that is marked by a number of very long compounds for the purpose of giving it the appearance of literary prose.

LYRIC POETRY[3]

Lyric is the oldest Indian poetical composition known to us. The hymns to the gods and the sacrificial and magical songs of the Veda are the oldest of the extant Indian poetical compositions. Although the Vedas are essentially religious, we find in them con siderable amount of secular leanings. The Uṣas-hymns and the love-spell ballads sometimes remind us of the later lyric and the hymns referring to war magic in the Atharvaveda sound almost like very old war songs. Centuries later we find gems of lyrical

1. On the historical novel Harṣacarita, see below in the section "Ornate Novels".

2. A Chronicle of the Family of Rājā Kṛishṇachandra of Navadvīpa, Bengal. Ed. and translated by W. P e r t s c h , Berlin 1852.

3. Samples of Indian lyric in German translation are found among others in Th. A u f r e c h t , Blüthen aus Hindustan, Bonn 1873 and Beiträge zur Kenntnis indischer Dichter, ZDMG 36, 1882, 361 ff. and in Ind. Stud. 17, 1885, 168 ff; L. von S c h r o e d e r , Mangoblüten, Stuttgart 1892; Joh. H e r t e l , Indische gedichte, Stuttgart 1900; J. J. M e y e r , Kāvyasaṁgraha, Leipzig, Lotusverlag, [Indische Gedichte aus vier Jahrtausenden in deutscher Nachbildung von Otto von G l a s e n a p p , etc. Berlin 1925; P. E. P a v o l i n i , Poeti d'amore nell' India, Florenze, 1900, and S. K. D e, Treatment of Love in Sanskrit Literature, Calcutta 1929.]

poems full of deep sentiments, religious fervour and such internal natural feeling that for all the time has become special characteristic of Indian poetry in the songs of monks and nuns in Buddhist literature. We come by a love-song too in a Buddhist Sutta and find traces of a drink-song in a Buddhist Jātaka[1]. In the Aṇuogadārasutta of the Jaina canons some love-songs have been quoted as illustrations of sentiments in poetry[2]. The Jaina monk Hemacandra, in a narrative of the Pariśiṣṭaparvan has preserved for us match-songs to the accompaniment of the lute after the style of the Schnaderhüpfel of Germany.

The history of Indian metrics too makes it clear that love-lyrics were not only cultured early in India but also that they had developed a high degree of skill and poetic merit[3]. We have before us a fragment of the composition of the grammarian Patañjali, and that has been beautifully translated into German by Th. Aufrecht :[4]—

api vijahīhi dṛḍhopagūhaṁ tyaja navasaṁgamabhīruvallabham ।
aruṇakarodgama eṣa vartate varatano saṁpravadanti kukkuṭāḥ ॥

"Loose the arms, that encircle closely about me;
Bashful darling, I must let thee go;
Heareth thou, the cry of the waking cock;
And how shines forth the red morning sun[5]."

The oldest love-song certainly must not have been composed in Sanskrit, but in popular languages. And it is why that a greater part of the Indian lyric poetry belongs to Prākrit literature. But in old Indian literature, however, a few traces of real folk-songs are preserved for us in Prākrit lyric poems. The great bulk of even Prākrit lyrics too certainly belongs to ornate court poetry, exactly as the whole of Sanskrit lyric. The ornate metres originated first of all on the soil of the latter, whilst the popular and the Prākrit poetry

1. See above II, 79 ff.; transl. 101 ff.; 32, trans. 42 (Dighanikāya 21) and 116, transl. p. 143 (Jātaka 512).

2. Weber, Indische Stud. 16, 154 ff.; Hertel, Ausgewählte Erzählungen aus Hemacandras Pariśiṣṭaparvan, p. 204 ff.

3. See above, p. 28, transl. p. 32. [Partly quoted under Pāṇini I, 3, 48.]

4. Ujjvaladatta's Commentary on the Uṇādisūtras, ed., London 1859, p. 150. Cf. Weber, Ind. Studien 8, 172 f.; Jacobi, ZDMG 48, 445.

[5. The proper translation would be :
"Away with hard embrace; leave the husband who is timid in respect of the union that is recent. It is dawn: O beautiful-limbed girl, loudly declare the cocks."

employed mainly the simple Āryā metre, the proper metre for melodious songs[1].

Fortunately for us there is preserved in the Sattasaī[2] or the "Seven Hundred Stanzas" of Hāla Sātavāhana a collection of Prākrit songs, that gives us a nice representation of the way in which the people in ancient India sang about pleasure and sorrow of love. As Prākrit was not a popular language, but probably a literary dialect formed on the model of and in conscious imitation of the spoken popular dialects, these Prākrit lays are not in fact folk-songs in the real sense of the word, but probably popular models of imitated creations of Indian ornate poets, who strove not only for describing the life and acitivity, above all the life of love, but would also reflect in the feelings and sentiments of the country girls and country lads, the herdsmen and cowherdesses, the female gardener, miller's wife, the hunter and the labourer. In this collection of songs (according to A. Wilbrandt) "the peaceful and private life of the Indian people, particularly in village and in nature, is described in songs and is sung; then these quatrains were intended to be sung. All the landscapes, the seasons and the pleasure and pain of weather play their part; but there is always the urging of the heart. Feelings that are most tender and most

1. The Āryā metre was first taken into Sanskrit poetry from Prākrit poetry; see Jacobi, ZDMG 40, 1886, 336 ff. There is an inscription that proves the existence of lyric poetry in old Prākrit: see Lüders, Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen, p. 62.

2. The Sanskrit rendering of this title, that is in Prākrit, is Saptaśatī. Other titles are: Gāthāsaptaśatī, Gāthākośa, Saptaśataka. Edition and German translation by A. Weber, AKM. V. 1870; VII, 1881; cf. ZDMIG 26, 1872, 735 ff.; 28, 1874, 345 ff.; Ind. Stud. 16, 1883, and Deutsche Rundschau. vol. 42, 1885, p. 223 ff. The translations of Weber are whodly literal and have nothing of poetical reproduction. Specimens of meterial translation have been given by H. Brunnhofer, Über den Geist der indischen Lyrik, Leipzig, 1882, p. 24 ff., and G. Meyer, Essays und Studien, Strassburg 1885, p. 289 ff. Brunnhofer has mostly doubled the small stanzas and he has rather composed his own poems on the basis of those of India, whilst Meyer has often made his rendering more compact than the Indian poem from the stanzas of Hāla. Adolph Wilbrandt has done the best (in a small selection on 32 stanzas published in the "Neuen Freien Presse" in Vienna on April 19, 1899 and in a second selection of 62 stanzas as published in Vol. 87, 1900 in the "Westermanns Illustrierten Monatschriften); here the Indian stanzas have literally and faithfully been reproduced, and yet the translation is a poetical reproduction. The text with the commentary of Gaṅgādharabhaṭṭa has also been published in Km. 21, 1889. [The śatakas IV-VII with Haritāmrapitāmbara's commentary have been published by Jagadīsh Lāl Shāstrī, Lahore 1942; Text with an elaborate introduction and Marāṭhī trans. by Jogalekar, Poona 1956. Cf. Keith, HSL. p. 223 ff.]

sensuous are often frankly expressed; the tender feeling dominates. It is not a man who often speaks, but it is a female voice that we hear in it more and more; the women who speak are old, young, friend, mother, daughter and aunt. They speak to young men and girls who are in love, to other girls or to their ownselves. They probably talk about so many things, yet the theme of the talk is always love."

Generally each of the stanzas is complete in itself; only now and then two or three such stanzas are combined to form one song. In the most concised form, in a few words a sentiment is expressed, a lament is made or the pleasure of the highest sensuous charms of love is described. A small picture, very often drawn with a few strokes from actual life, is brought in. There we hear the words of a damsel in love who gives expression to her feeling of anguish on account of love or to her longings. She requests the moon to touch her with the same ray-hands with which she had touched also her lover who is tarrying in a distant land. As in the whole of Indian love lyrics[1], so in these songs too, the wailing of the husband or of the beloved always occurs, likewise the longing of a man living in a distant place for his beloved staying in a foreign land. So a traveller speaks to the cloud to thunder over his head as much as it likes, but it should not kill his beloved. A woman counts on the fingers of her hands and feet the days that her husband has been away and weeps because there remains no finger for counting further (307). A young woman says:—

kallaṁ kila kharahiao pavasiihi piotti suṇṇaï jaṇammi ।
taha vaḍḍha bhaavaï ṇise jaha se kallaṁ via ṇa hoi ॥

"They say that my hard-hearted husband is going away early in the morning tomorrow; sacred night, please extend theyself, that there never comes the dawn."

(Transl. according to A. Wilbrandt).

1. The same is still the case with popular poems in India; See F. Rosen, die Indrasabhā des Amānat. Leipzig 1892, p. 28, where as an example has been quoted the fine Indian song :

"My husband went out in search of gold, and my house became desolate: he found no gold and has not returned back: and my hair has become silver."
Km. 1, 46.

Another woman addresses her female friend in the following words:—

ajjaṁ pi tāva ekkaṁ mā māṁ vārehi piasahi ruantiṁ ।
kalliṁ uṇa tammi gae jaï ṇa muā tā ṇa rodissaṁ ॥

"O dear friend, only till today, only upto this day, do not prevent me from weeping. In case I do not die when it is morning and he is away I shall weep no more[1]." (Trans. according to Wilbrandt.)

What tenderness springs forth from the following picture:—

The beloved husband has returned back home, but the wife does not decorate hereself for his reception, since she does not like to hurt her unfortunate lady-neighbour, whose lover is still on his sojourn. She further sings many pathetic little songs in her continuous separation. A young farmer, whose wife is dead, asks the room to restore his former amorous pleasures, as the hiding place of his stolen property. The deepest is the idea expressed in a few words, that according to the translation of Wilbrandt can be rendered as:—

"When of the two, who have grown up closely together gradually for a long time in pleasure and pain, one dies, that one lives, but that (one who lives) is dead[2]."

samasokkhadukkhaparivaḍḍhiāṇaṁ kāleṇa rūḍḍhapemmāṇaṁ ।
mihuṇāṇaṁ maraï jaṁ taṁ khu jiaï iaraṁ muaṁ hoi ॥

The following little song shows that the husband in a foreign land is not always an object of lamemtation for the wife left by him at home:—

"About me, the night, that is unkind, envelops everything;
Away is (my) husband, vacant is my house;
I am afraid; they may hence abduct me away;
So, O Darling, for my protection, please come in[3]."
(Translation according to that of G. Meyer; Km. 4, 35).

The following song too sings the secret love:—

1. Km. 6, 2.

2. Km. 2, 42. Weber compares with this stanza (142) the beautiful expression from Bhavabhūti's Mālatīmādhava.

"He, about whom one who loves him thinks, is not dead".

[3. Literal transl. of the stanza:—Of the couple, who have deep love developed (for each other), who have grown....]

coriaraasaddhālui mā putti bbhamasu andhaārammi ।
ahiaaraṁ lakkhijjasi tamabharie dīvasīhavva ॥

"O girl, I caution you,
If you meet (your lover) in the dark,
The glitter will betray you,
Since your beautiful eyes are sparkling."
(Transl. according to that of Meyer, Km. 5, 15)

It is understood that in many songs the theme is about the quarrel and skirmishes of the lovers. Here are two examples:—

de suaṇu pasia ehṇiṁ puṇo vi sulahāi rūsiavvāiṁ ।
esā maacchi maalañchaṇujjalā galaï chaṇarāī ॥

"Can'st you quarrel still in the morning;
Do you yet have in mind there will be dawn again;
This illuminated full-moon night,
In amorous sport, please let it pass."
(Translated according to G. Meyer, Km. 5, 66);

"When the stars were fading, I wanted to rebuke him,
I wanted to show my wrath and displeasure,
I wanted to scold him too;
And all, as you liked, you girl,
When I must not look at him."
(Transl. according to that of A. Wilbrandt 743).

The following strophe Weber 498, Km. 5, 98) presents a charming picture in its simplicity :

muhapecchao paī se sāvi hu savisesadaṁsaṇummaiā ।
dovi kaatthā puhaïṁ amahilapurisaṁ va maṇṇanti ॥

"He looks at her deeply into her face;
She is sunk in his vision;
Thus looking at each other in great joy.
As if for them they were all alone in the world[1]."

In other songs the pleasures of love and beauty of youth have been depicted in glowing but in westerners' taste in altogether voluptuous colours. The bosom bulging out of the bodice has been compared with the moon rising

1. W. has translated into a German verse as above. The translator's rendering would be:—
"Her husband was looking at her face;
She too was maddened by gazing at him :
The two, who had attained their goal,
Seemed to feel as if the earth was deviod of women and men."

out from the clouds. The breasts of the female miller that have become dusty with flour are the two swans that have hidden their faces inside lotuses. In these songs often we find talk about bitings and scratchings as well. The crescent of the moon covered in the glue of the evening redness of the sky is compared with the nail-scratch on the bosom of a young damsel shimmering through red silk garment. They bring before our eyes the picture of family-life too. The angry wife is obliged to smile when her little son with a jerk climbs on the back of her husband who has fallen at her feet. A pregnant woman, asked about her health,* just casts her glance gently at her lover. A woman is enchanted to see the first little tooth of her child and shows it to her husband. In many stanzas (407, 449, 635) we find references to burning of widows: While on one hand we find these pictures in which the village scenes prevail by far, we find on the other songs that belong to the city harem life, and there are many stanzas (thus 887f.) that can outright be designated as songs about courtesans.

In addition to these pictures from life of man we find in other songs pictures from nature . We find here a description of the summer midday or a touching picture of the rainy season or of the autumn in four small lines. We see bees hovering about buds and blossoms. We meet with thunderstorms. The pictures from the life of beasts are not rare. We find a pair of elephants in love, a bull and a cow in love, a monkey and a she-monkey in a funny situation. Shot with the arrow of a hunter, a she-antelope gazes for a long time at her consort. At one place we find a peacock licking the dew-drops deposited over the blades of grass, and at another cranes with their curved neck sitting motionless, whilst they are obliged to hang their wings after it has rained. Often the picture is just a comparison. The clouds are dispersed—the Vindhyā mountain spreads out its mantle. Or the earth bedecked with yellow flowers looks as if monks (with their yellow cowls) had sunk into the earth out of veneration for Buddha[1].

1. "The commentators try to find in each of these stanzas, an erotic meaning or some similar sense, although they have nothing to do with erotics. Western scholars need not follow them always, even when they too often are correct."

We find a number of a p h o r i s m s in the Sattasaī. In one of these aphorisms it has appropriately been said that a miser utilizes his wealth to the same extent as a wanderer his own shadow. Other sayings describe the evils of the world. Thus it is said that it is no wonder that noble people are so rare in the world : the earth does not have so many geese as there are cranes. Another stanza (704) praises the deaf and the blind [Km. 7. 95]:

dhaṇṇā bahirā andhā te ccia jīanti māṇuse loe ।
ṇa suṇanti pisuṇavaaṇaṁ khalāṇā̃ ṛddhiṁ ṇa pekkhanti ॥

"Happy are the deaf and the blind,
Who alone truly live in the world;
Since they hear not the harsh words
And do not see the prosperity of the ignoble."

Lastly there are a number of verses in this collection that have been brought in torn out from some other context; may be, they belong to some epic or dramatic composition, as for example the verses of which the love between Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā or between Śiva and Pārvatī is the theme; or when it is said about captive women that they await rescue by some hero; or when the theme is more suitable for a narrative (as a type of fairy-tale verse), as for in the lines told about women abducted by robbers or as in those written about an unfaithful wife, who feigns scorpion-bite for the purpose of being carried to the house of her paramour for obtaining medicine (Km. 237).

The motely contents of "seven hundred stanzas" already point to the fact that here we do not have before us the work of a single writer, but that of a compiler. On the other hand, however, the songs show such a striking unified characteristic that we can in no case consider H ā l a, to whom is attributed the collection, merely a compiler of an anthology, but rather a gifted redactor, who made the selection with dexterity and skill and probably gave to the stanzas the final poetical form for the first time. So is explained by the introductory stanza No. 3:—"From innumerable musical strophes, Hāla, the friend of poets, has made the collection of seven hundred beautiful (literally provid-

ed with alaṁkāras or means adornment) stanzas"[1]. Bāṇa too found in Hāla something more than a compiler, when in the introduction to his Harṣacarita (verse 14) he says—"Sātavāhana (i.e. Hāla) with his beautiful songs composed in 101 faultless metres has built up an imperishable charming store, as (a king, an inexhaustible treasure, not collected from villages) with diamonds (of unadulterated purity)[2]. A tradition is that Bhāratī, the goddess of poetry, stayed for one and a half-day in the camp of Sātavāhana and generated taste in all people from the lowest down to the elephant-drivers and horse-grooms for Prākrit poetry and the king made his selection of 700 stanzas out of what they composed. Perhaps it will not be audacious to assume that this tradition just means that the king in fact made a collection of the songs from the mouth of the people and out of them made a selection of 700 stanzas and gave them a literary form[3].

In the purāṇas[4], Hāla appears as the seventeenth in the list of Āndhra - or Āndhrabhṛtya-rulers, all of whom bore the epithet Sātavāhana or Śālivāhana as their family title and who ruled in the Deccan from the middle of the 3rd century B.C. down to the beginning of the 3rd century A.D.[5]. Since

[1. The stanza reads : *satta sattāiṁ kaïvacchalena kodīa majjhaārammi* I
hālena viraïāiṁ sālaṁkārāṇa gāhāṇaṁ II

2. The expression *agrāmya* "not boorish" is used intentionally for the purpose of conveying the meaning that although the poems belong to rural life, yet they are not "vulgar, crude". The verse has two meanings, hence the bracketed words in the translation.

3. Peterson (Kādambarī Ed., Introd. p. 74 ff.) propounds the theory that Hāla had himself mainly composed the stanzas of the Sattasaī. In the commentaries written in later centuries, the Sattasaī is treated altogether as an anthology and in it we find names of writers of individual stanzas. In respect of these names, however, the manuscripts differ very much from one another: most of them give names only in the beginning of the work and then stop. The commentaries of the Vulgata give 112 names, Bhuvanapāla gives 384. In the Km. edition the names of probable authors too are given in the gāthānukramaṇikā. Yet in many cases the names are wanting, and often Hāla himself is mentioned as the author. In the opinion of W. these names are quite unreliable. A different view is that of Pischel (Grammatik der Prākrit Sprachen § 13), who concludes from the names given that the Sattasaī presupposes a very rich Prākrit literature, in which women also had their contributions.

4. F. E. Pargiter, The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, Oxford 1913, pp. 36, 71.

5. According to R. G. Bhandarkar (Early History of the Deccan. 2nd Ed., Bombay 1895, 31 ff., 36 ff.), the Āndhras ruled from 73 B. C. upto 218 A.D., according to Smith (ZDMG 56, 1902, 649 ff. and Early History 207 ff., 215 ff.) from 240 or 230 B.C. to 225 A.D., [according to K. P. Jayaswal. JBORS, 16, 1930, pp. 258ff. and 278 ff. from 213 B. C. upto 238 A.D.]

Hāla[1] appears in the list approximately in the middle, he must have lived in the first or second century A.D. The correctness of this tradition is supported also by the fact that almost all the inscriptions of the Āndhra kings are in Prākrit[2]. Besides the repeated mention of the names of the Vindhya-hills and of the Godāvarī in the anthology lends further support to the view that the work of its compilation was done in the north-eastern part of the Deccan, and the Āndhras ruled just in the same region.

The Sattasaī has come down to us in not less than 6 different recensions, and this points to its extraordinary popularity. These recensions differ from one another not only in respect of the form of the text and the order of stanzas, but also in that of the textual subject-matter. Only 430 verses are found in all the different recensions. From its appearance it seems that the collection originally had much of uniform character and bore the stamp of an independent work in a certain sense and it received all the form and character of a colourful anthology of Prākrit poems, first of all in the hands of the copyists, who collected Prākrit verses from miscellaneous sources and increased the bulk of the incomplete manuscript with their own collections. When we speak of the Sattasaī as a work perhaps written in the 2nd century A.D. we mean by it only the basic stock of the text. At the most only the stanzas that are found in all the recensions can be considered to belong to such a high antiquity[3].

Daṇḍin states that Māhārāṣṭrī is the "best Prākrit" and this supports the view that the Sattasaī is the oldest work written in the Māhārāṣṭrī dialect, and this points also to its far remote antiquity[4].

1. Weber, who thinks that Sattasaī must have been written in the 3rd century A. D. at the earliest and in the 7th century A.D. at the latest, is of the opinion that since the word Hāla means "ploughman", the collection got this name from the country songs. Smith, ZDMG 56, 660 f. places him in about 60 or 70 A.D.

2. Like Vikramāditya, who has been made the central point of Sanskrit literature, the name of Sātavāhana later got associated with the whole of Prākrit poetry of later years. But since Sātavāhana (or Śālivāhana) is the family-title of all the Āndhra kings, all the traditions that refer to King Sātavāhana (e.g. in the Kathāsaritsāgara and in Prabandhacintāmaṇi) do not have any historical value. The Jainas have naturally made him a Jaina Saint. Cf. Ras. S. V. N. Maṇḍalik in JBRAS 10, 1873, 127 ff.

3. On the high antiquity of the Prākrit lyrics in general see also Konow, GGA, 1894 476 f. and Karpūramañjarī, p. 192 f.

4. Māhārāṣṭrī is the dialect of Mahārāṣṭra, the land of the Marāṭhas,

The great popularity of the work as well as uncertainty of the text is proved not only by its different manuscripts and recensions, but also by the large number of quotations from Hāla found in works of poetics. A majority of such quotations found in these works are not traceable in any of the known recensions[1]. The manner in which the rhetoricians quote Hāla, although he is not a Sanskrit poet, proves the high respect that the Sattasaī enjoyed at the hands of the scholars of poetics[2].

The dramas and anthologies show that Prākrit lyrics existed also in later times. Hemacandra in his Prākrit grammar cites a number of beautiful little stanzas in the Apabhraṁśa dialect[3]. We do not know the time when they were composed. But in their nature they differ so little from the songs of Sattasaī that some specimens are given here :

bitṭīe maï bhaṇiya tuhuṁ mā karu vaṅkī diṭṭhi ।
putti sakaṇṇī bhalli jiva maraï hiaï païṭṭhi ॥

"O girl, I told you do not send side-glances at me ; for those glances entering into the heart (of others) kill them as a spear with sharp bent edge" (VIII, 4, 330).

vippiaāraü jaï vi piu to vi taṁ āṇahi ajju ।
aggiṇa daddhā jaïvi gharu to teṁ aggiṁ kajju ॥

"Friend, bring to me today my beloved, though he has offended me; for one has to do with fire even though it has burnt one's house." (VIII, 4, 343).

bhallā huā ju māriā bahiṇi mahārā kantu ।
lajjejjaṁ tu vayaṁsiahu jaï bhaggā ghara entu ॥

"It was well, O sister, that my husband was killed (in battle). I would have been put to shame in the

in whose, metropolis, Pratiṣṭhāna, the Āndhra-kings resided. Since the work is written in musical stanzas (gāhā=gāthā) the linguistic form of the dialect has become problematic. In the dramas too the musical stanzas are always in the Māhārāṣṭri dialect. Cf. G. Garrez in JA, p. 6, part XX, 1872, 197ff. and Pischel, Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen §§ 2 and 12 f.

1. Cf. Weber's edition, introduction, p. XLIII ff. The same writer in Ind. Stud. 16, 202 ff. has given a list of the alaṁkāras employed in the Sattasaī.

2. Ānandavardhana, particularly selects his examples for suggested meaning, irony etc. from the Sattasaī, see Dhvanyāloka I, 4; II, 35; III, 16; 39.

3. R. Pischel, Materialen zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṁśa, AGGW, N. F. Vol. V, No. 4, Berlin 1902. (On Apabhraṁśa lyrics of Jainas and Buddhists, see Jacobi—Sanatkumāracaritam, Introduction p. XVIII ff.).

presence of my friends if he had returned home defeated." (VIII, 4, 351).

vrāsu mahārisi eu bhanaï jaï suisatthu pamānu ।
māyahaṁ calaṇanavantāhaṁ divi divi gaṅgā ṇhāṇu ॥

"Vyāsa, the great sage, tells that if the Vedas and śāstras are to be regarded as authoritative, then those who salute the feet of their m o t h e r s get the merit of bathing in the Gaṅgā everyday (VIII, 4, 399).

Not from the Prākrit lyrics, but parallel with it, developed the Sanskrit lyrics. But since we know about the famous prized Buddhist songs of A ś v a g h o ṣ a only in heresays, and about those of M ā t ṛ c e ṭ a only in fragments[1] and as only a few stanzas of B h ā s a's songs are found available to us in anthologies, for us, the first great lyric poet of Sanskrit is K ā l i d ā s a . In his epic and dramatic poems Kālidāsa is more or less a lyric writer, and probably the best pieces that he composed in the form of musical poems are contained in many portions of his epics and particularly in his dramas. Kālidāsa is always at the summit of his art in places where he has depicted sentiment and where nature-description and human-feelings are mixed up together in pictures. His most famous lyric poem, however, is the M e g h a d ū t a "the Poem of the Cloud-Messenger"[2], that is counted by Indians among his great epics

1. See above II, 203, 211 f., transl. 258-9, 271 ff.

2. The exact title is (*meghadūtaṁ kāvyam*). Commonly the title is given as the Meghadūta, the "Cloud-Messenger". E d i t i o n s : by J. G i l d e m e i s t e r (with Latin Glossary), Bonn 1841; with critical notes and vocabulary by A. F. S t e n z l e r , Breslau 1874; with the commentary of Mallinātha by N. B. G o d a b o l e and K. P. P a r a b a . 2nd Ed. Bombay 1886, NSP. The best edition is that of E. H u l t z s c h with the excellent and oldest commentary of Vallabhadeva and a Sanskrit—English vocabulary, London 1911. Translations:—in English verses by H. H. W i l s o n , Calcutta 1813, with numerous interesting parallels from Classical and English poetry, that the translator gives in his notes. The second edition (1843) is reprinted as a supplement to the very valuable German prose translation with notes by C. S c h u t z , Bielefeld 1859. (Wilson's translation has again been published in his works, vol. 4.). Metrical German translations of M a x - M ü l l e r (Königsberg 1847); of E. M e i e r , Die Klassischen Dichtungen der Inder, III, 90 ff.; of L. F r i t z e (Chemnitz 1879), with the help of a manuscript of the prose translation of S t e n z l e r); very much free and abridged by Max Múler in the "Bühne and Welt", V, 1, 1903, p. 17 ff. French by A. G u e r i n o t, Paris 1902. An anonymous English translation in the Pandit, Vol. II. English prose translations of J a c o b , P a t h a k and N a n d a r g i k a r a have been mentioned by H u l t z s c h , ibid p. XIV. [With D a k ṣ i ṇ ā v a r t a n ā t h a ' s commentary, ed. T. G a ṇ a p a t i Ś ā s t r ī , TSS. 1919; with P ū r ṇ a s a r a s v a t ī's commentary, ed.

(mahākāvyas). It can be designated as an "epic inasmuch as the lyric stanzas are clothed in an epic form. The subject-matter is as follows:—

A Yakṣa, i.e. a class of celestial beings who are in the service of the god Kubera, had offended his master by some dereliction in the discharge of his duty, and for this his lord banished him for a year. He is obliged to leave his home and wife and to wander in the Rāma-hill in the south. In the eighth month of his banishment, just in the beginning of the rainy season, he sees a thundering cloud, that is moving from the south towards his homeland that was in the north; then he implores the cloud to convey his message to his aggrieved wife separated from him. He accurately describes to the cloud the path that he will have to traverse to reach his home in the Kailāsa hill, where in the city of Alakā is situated his castle, in which his wife is sorrowing all alone. This offers the poet a great opportunity to describe nature in a splendid manner. With particular affection he tarries when he describes his own native town Ujjayinī and Alakā, the city of the Yakṣas. The poet throughout fills our mind with wonder with his forceful pictures and similes. The black cloud spreads along the stream that resembles the pearl-band of the earth, in the middle of which shines forth a black saphire. The Kailāsa, with its snow-covered peaks resembling water-lilies, rises up in the sky and looks every night like the thundering laughter of Śiva[1]. The city of Alakā, that is situated by the side of the Kailāsa hill, down which flows the river Gaṅgā, resembles a damsel lying in the lap of her lover (the hill, with her garment (the Gaṅgā) hanging down. The mansions surrounded by the clouds in the rainy season are comparable with a woman's dark hairs interwoven with a net of pearls. After the Yakṣa has

K.V. Krisnamacharya, Shrirangam 1909; With the comms. of Mallinātha and Caritravardhana, ed Nārāyaṇa Śāstrī Khiste, Vārāṇasi, 1931; Eng. trans. G. J. Somayāji Madras 1934.]

1. Indian poets always describe laughter as white. We may approximately say: "Like the white shining teeth of loudly laughing Śiva", although the whiteness does not belong only to the white teeth, but perhaps rather also to the face that is shining on account of her laugh.

accurately described to the cloud the city and his castle, he begins to describe the beauty of his wife, as he imagines her after the prolonged separation. And lastly he communicates the text of the message that he should convey with his thundering voice to his beloved. He asks him to speak to her how he always anxiously thinks about her:—

śyāmāsvaṅgaṁ cakitahariṇaprekṣite dṛṣṭipātaṁ
gaṇḍacchāyāṁ śaśini śikhināṁ barhabhāreṣu keśān ।
utpaśyāmi pratanuṣu nadīvīcişu bhrūvilāsān
hantaikasthaṁ kvacidapi na te bhīru sādṛśyamasti ॥
tvāmālikhya praṇayakupitāṁ dhāturāgaiḥ śilāyām
ātmānaṁ te caraṇapatitaṁ yāvadicchāmi kartum ।
asraistāvanmuhurupacitairdṛṣṭirālipyate me
krūrastasminnapi na sahate saṅgamaṁ nau kṛtāntaḥ ॥

"Perhaps I may see in the priyaṅgu creeper thy body, thy glance in the look of an amazed antelope, the shade of thy temple in the moon, thy lock of hairs in the tail of a peacock, the sport of thy eye-brows, in the slender waves of the river; but alas, O timid one, thy resemblance is not available in obeity at one place."

"Very often when I desire to paint thee in saffron colour over a slab of stone, showing thee in an angry pose in our quarrel of love, and to make myself fall upon thy feet (in order to apease thee), my vision gets obstructed with long deposited tears: the cruel god of fate does not tolerate our union even there[1]."

bhūyāścāha tvamapi śayane kaṇṭhalagnā purā me
nidrāṁ gatvā kimapi rudatī sasvanaṁ viprabuddhā ।
sāntarhāsaṁ kathitamasakṛtpṛcchataśca tvayā me
dṛṣṭaḥ svapne kitava ramayankāmapi tvaṁ mayeti ॥

"He further says—once when you were although clinging to my neck (on the bed), you fell asleep and then woke up with a cry for some reason or other; and when I asked you repeatedly (the reason of that), you said with a suppressed smile—you rogue, I saw you, in my dream, frolicking with some other woman[2]."

1. Translation into English from German by Max Müller.
2. Translation into English from German by L. Fritze.

Goethe, who had known about the "Cloud-Messenger" through Wilson's translation expressed his admiration for the poem in the "Zahmen Xenien" in the following verse:

"Was will man denn vergnüglicheres wissen !
Sakontala, Nala, die muss man küssen;
Und Megha-Dūta, den Wolkengesandten,
Wer schickt ihn nicht gern zu seelenverwandten[1] !"
"What more pleasant, shall we know,
Than Śakuntalā, Nala, that we must kiss;
And Megha-Dūta, the cloud-messenger,
Who is there who will not like to send him to his soul !"

Alexander von Humboldt[2] praises "the admirable trueness to nature" with which the first advent of the cloud in the beginning of the rainy season is described in the Meghadūta. L. W. Schroeder[3] vouchsafes the value of the poem as "a treasure of unestimable value" and G. Meyer[4] describes it as "the most beautiful bewailing of a yearning lover, that one can read."

As regards the Indians themselves they have all the time esteemed the poem as a piece of extraordinarily high value. It is a thing that points to the circumstances in which the text has not come down to us in an unmutilated form, and that in it verses got interpolated already quite early[5].

The fame of the Meghadūta in India is proved also by the extraordinarily numerous imitations of the poem in later-day Indian literature. So is the poet Dhoī, the writer of

1. About Meghadūta in the Noten und Abhandlungen zum Divan (Jubilaumsausgabe, Vol. 5, p. 360) Goethe says: "The first acquaintance with such a work always makes an epoch in our life". And in the article "Indische und Chinesische Dichtung" (Vol. 37, p. 210) he speaks in praise of the poem that it "describes purely human relationship". Cf. also P. Th. Hoffmann, Der indische und der deutsche Geist, p. 28 ff., 46.

2. Kosmos II, 40. He compares his own lovely description of the advent of the rainy season in the tropics of America in his "Ansichten der Natur" (2nd Ed. 1826, I, 33 ff.), that he wrote before he had read Kālidāsa's Meghadūta.

3. ILC 548 ff.

4. Essays und Studien II, 99.

5. The history of the text is given clearly in the edition Hultzsch. On textual criticism see also Macdonell, JRAS 1913, 176 ff. and Hari Chand, Kālidāsa, p. 238 ff.

Pavanadūta[1] or Wind-Messenger" in which a Gandharva girl sends her message by the wind to King Lakṣmaṇasena, whom she loves. Another imitation, that is rather slavish, of the Meghadūta is the poem Śukasaṁdeśa[2] of a poet Lakṣmīdāsa, in which a parrot takes the place of the cloud. [Then there is one Bhramarasandeśa "The Bee-Messenger of Vāsudeva.]

Haṁsadūta of Rūpagosvāmin (16th century), Padāṅkadūta of Kṛṣṇas' arman Sārvabhauma (written in 1723 A.D.), two different poems bearing the title Uddhavadūta, one of an unknown poet and the other of a poet Mādhava, who probably lived in the 17th century, are devoted to the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa[3]. More important than these and seemingly later imitations, in spite of their age, are the Jaina poems Pārśvābhyudaya and Nemidūta[4] already mentioned before. The Meghadūta of Kālidāsa was not only translated into Singhalese even by the Buddhists of Ceylon but was also imitated by them[5]. The fame of Kālidāsa extended upto Tibet as well and we have a Tibetan translation

1. Edited by M. Chakravarti in JASB, N. S. 1, 1905, 41-71. See above p. 56, Pischel, H. L. 33 ff. and Aufrecht, ZDMG 54, 1900, 616 ff., where nine more imitations of the Meghadūta are enumerated. A second poem with the title Pavanadūta by a poet Vādicandra Sūri has been published in Km., Part XIII, 9-24. [On Dhoī, see Vidhuśekhara Bhattacharya, IHQ, 2, 1926, p. 878 ff]

2. Edited by Mahārāja Rāmavarmā of Travancore in the JRAS 1884, 401 ff., where is provided a complete list of other similar imitations (Sandeśas, i.e., messages). The work is well-known in Malabar; see Rāmavarmā, JRAS, 1910, 638.

3. Cf. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1467 ff; Haeberlin 374-400, 401-409, 323-347, 348-373. In the Padāṅka or Kṛṣṇapadāṅkadūta have been described the bewailings of a cowherdess, who discovered the footprint of Kṛṣṇa in the grove and is reminded thereby of her absent lover. In the Manodūta the poet Viṣṇudāsa makes his own mind the messenger for the purpose of giving expression to his own feeling of devotion to Viṣṇu; see Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1470. Another poem bearing the same title and composed by Vrajanātha (1758) is not really an imitation of Meghadūta. It describes the message that Draupadī sends to Lord Kṛṣṇa, while her garment is being removed from her body; see Km., Part XII, pp. 84-130; Krishnamacharya 128 f. There are number of verses in the Jātaka No. 297 (cf. Pischel, HL, 28 note), in which an impaled man gives a passing crow a love-complaint to his beloved: they are neither imitation nor prototype to these "messages", but are interesting parallels to these.

4. See above, II, 338, transl. p. 512.

5. In Singhalese there is "Peacock-Messenge" (14th century) and a number of other "Messages"; see Geiger, Literatur und Sprache der Singhalesen (Grundriss 1,10), p. 9; Hultzsch, loc. cit. p. VIII f.

of the Meghadūta, probably written in the 13th century A.D. included in the Tanjūr[1].

With regard to the numerous other lyric poems that are attributed to Kālidāsa, it is doubtful whether the name of the great poet is correctly associated with them. Of them the Ṛtusaṁhāra [2] "Short description of the Seasons", on account of its antiquity, as also on account of its language and poetical perfection may possibly be easily included in the works of the great poet[3]. In this poem the series of six seasons—the summer, the rains, the autumn, the winter, the time of frost and the spring—are described in splendid colours. These descriptions with their delicate observation of nature, lovely sketches about the happiness of animals and plants and glowing and often luxuriant presentation of amorous pleasures in each of these seasons are probably worthy of Kālidāsa. This conclusion will be confirmed by some probes according to the beautiful translation of P. V. Bohlen :—

From the description of the summer :

1. The Tibetan translation of Kālidāsa's Meghadūta, according to the red and black Tanjūr, has been published and rendered into German by H. Bekh (Supplement to ABA 1906). Cf. G. Huth, SBA 1895, 268 f., 281 ff., and Beckh, Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik von Kālidāsas Meghadūta, Diss., Berlin 1907.

2. W. Jones had published the text in Calcutta in 1792; P. von Bohlen has published it with Latin and German metrical translations Lipsiae 1840. Of mediocre merit is the translation of A. Hoefer, Indische Gedichte, I, 65 ff. With the commentary of Manirāma, the text has been published in Bombay NSP. 1906. [P. Bohlen's German translation has recently been published by H. Kreyenborg in the Insel Bücherei No. 280].

3. The authenticity of the Ṛtusaṁhāra is often likewise doubted as already stated. J. Nobel (ZDMG 66, 1912, 275 ff; 73, 1919, 194 ff.; JRAS 1913, 401 ff.) is the last scholar to doubt its authenticity, whilst A. B. Keith (JRAS 1912, 1066) has defended it. A. Gawroński (The digvijaya of Raghu and some connected problems, p. 29, note 3) refutes the authorship of this poem to Kālidāsa. However, it is, generally admitted that the Ṛtusaṁhāra is already imitated in the Mandasor-inscription (472 A.D.) (see Kielhorn, NGGW 1890, 251 ff.), therefore, it must have been of a time not far from the works of Kālidāsa. That Ṛtusaṁhāra, in many respects differs from the other poems of Kālidāsa can be easily explained from the fact, that it belongs to some other class. However, the circumstance that the Ṛtusaṁhāra is nowhere cited in the works of rhetorics speaks against its authenticity; see Hari Chand, Kālidāsa, p. 240 ff. In the beginning of the 18th century A.D. Viśveśvara, in his poem Ṣaḍṛtuvarṇana, has already imitated it (see Krishnamacharya 128) [Hillebrandt, Kālidāsa p. 66 ff., considers the Ṛtusaṁhāra as "the earliest work of Kālidāsa written in the days of his youth. See also S. K. De, JRAS 1927, pp. 109-10].

1 *mṛgāḥ pracaṇḍātapatāpitā bhṛśaṁ*
tṛṣā mahatyā pariśuṣkatālavaḥ ।
vanāntare toyamiti pradhāvitā
nirīkṣya bhinnāñjanasannibhaṁ nabhaḥ ॥
2 *ravermayūkhairabhitāpito bhṛśaṁ*
vidahyamānaḥ pathi taptapāṁśubhiḥ ।
avāṅmukhojihmagatiḥ śvasanmuhuḥ
phaṇī mayūrasya tale niṣīdati ॥
3 *tṛṣā mahatyā hatavikramodyamaḥ*
śvasanmuhurdūravidāritānanaḥ ।
na hantyadūrepi gajān mṛgeśvaro
vilolajihvaścalitāgrakesaraḥ ॥
4 *viśuṣkakaṇṭhāhṛtasīkarāmbhaso*
gabhastibhirbhānumatānutāpitāḥ ।
pravṛddhatṛṣṇopahatā jalārthino
na dantinaḥ kesariṇopi bibhyati ॥
5 *tṛṣākulaiścātakapakṣiṇāṁ kulaiḥ*
prayācitāstoyabharāvalambinaḥ ।
prayānti mandaṁ bahudhāravarṣiṇo
balāhakāḥ śrotramanoharasvanāḥ ॥
6 *sadāmanojñaṁ svanudtsavotsukaṁ*
vikīrṇavistīrṇakalāpaśobhitam ।
sasaṁbhramāliṅganacumbanākulaṁ
pravṛttanṛtyaṁ kulamadya barhiṇām ॥
7 *nipātayantyaḥ paritastaṭadrumān*
pravṛddhavegaiḥ salilairanirmalaiḥ ।
striyaḥ suduṣṭā iva jātavibhramāḥ
prayānti nadyastvaritaṁ payonidhim ॥
8 *payodharairbhīmagabhīranisvanais-*
taḍidbhirudvejitacetaso bhṛśam ।
kṛtāparādhānapi yoṣitaḥ priyān
pariṣvajante śayane nirantaram ॥

1. "Tormented by the blazing sunshine, the deer with dried palate on account of intense thirst, beholding the powdered collyrium-like sky and thinking it to be water, have run to another forest."

2. "Incessantly scorched by the rays of the sun, heating with the heated sand on the path, the snake with his hood turned downward, not moving in an oblique manner, panting again and again, rests under (the shadow

of) the plumes of a peacock."

3. "The king of the animals, deprived of his valour and endeavour by excessive thirst, with his quivering mane, lolling tongue, yawning mouth and panting again and again, does not kill even the elephants that are not far away."

4. "The tuskers who have oozed out water-drops through their dried throat, tormented by the rays of the sun, suffering from increased thirst, desiring water, do not fear even the lions."

5. "Asked by the flocks of cātaka birds, tormented by thirst, the clouds, bending down with the weight of water, showering rains in torrents and producing sounds aggreeable to the ear; are moving slowly."

6. "Always sounding charmingly, eager for the lovefeast, looking beautiful with outstretched luxuriant plumage, the flock of peacocks, anxious for embrace and kiss, has now got engaged in dance."

7. "The rivers with turbid water, with increased speed, throwing down trees (standing) on their banks, are fast running to the sea, as wanton women, exhibiting amorous gestures."

8. "The women, repeatedly tormented with flashes of lightening and the clouds thundering terribly and deeply, incessantly embrace on their bed even their guilty lovers."

It is further doubtful whether the Śṛṅgāratilaka[1] "Decoration of Love", a small collection of stanzas with erotic theme, can be attributed to Kālidāsa. The following little song demonstrates that this anthology too contains beautiful stanzas :

indīvareṇa nayanaṁ mukhamambujena
kundena dantamadharaṁ navapallavena ।
aṅgāni campakadalaiśca vidhāya vedhāḥ
kānte kathaṁ ghaṭitavānupalena cetaḥ ॥[2]

1. Published in Haeberlin 14-17 (21 stanzas), in Kālidāsae Meghadūta et Śriṅgāratilaka ex rec. J. Gildemeisteri, Bonnae 1841 (23 stanzas) and as an appendix to the edition of the Ṛtusaṁhāra, Bombay NSP 1906 (31 stanzas). Śṛṅgārarasāṣṭaka, (Haeberlin 510 ff.), which also is attributed to Kālidāsa, is merely a compilation of erotic verses, of which the verse No. 4 might be of Kālidāsa and the verse No. 7 is taken from the Kumārasambhava.

2. Mangoblüten, p. 11. [German metrical transl. by L. V. Schroeder.]

"Having made thy eyes with blue lotus, the face with blue lotus, the teeth with Jasmine, the lower lip with a tender shoot, the limbs with leaves of campaka, tell me then, O beloved, how did the creator form thy heart with a slab of stone."

Of the religious hymns, the authorship of which is attributed to Kālidāsa, a mention may be made of one Śyāmalādaṇḍaka[1], the famous stotra of the Goddess Durgā, with its greater part in prose and of hymns Sarasvatīstotra and Maṅgalāṣṭaka[2] translated into Tibetan in the Tanjūr.

In several manuscripts, Ghaṭakarpara[3], "The Broken Jar" too is attributed to Kālidāsa. It is a poem of 22 elegantly rhyming stanzas, in which a young damsel, at the advent of the rains, gives expression to her feeling of anxiety for her husband, who is away, and sends to him her greeting through the clouds — hence a counterpart of the Meghadūta. The poem has obtained this title from the fact that the poet in its last verse offers to carry water in a broken jar to any poet who may surpass him in the matter of rhyming. Rückert[4] has rightly said that had this "broken vessel" been a German one, it would not have been even worth picking up at all", and that in respect of rhyming the water did not reach the Nalodaya. It is certain that the work is not of Kālidāsa. Frequently it is ascribed to a poet Ghaṭakarpara, who (according to the fashion of Persian poets) inscribed his name in the concluding stanza[5].

1. Published in Km., Part I, 8 ff.

2. F.W. Thomas in JRAS 1903, 785ff. The Maṅgalāṣṭaka is preserved in Sanskrit inscriptions as well; see Aufrecht, Leipzig No. 450 f.

3. Edited, translated (into German), imitated and annotated by G. M. Dursch, Berlin 1828; Haeberlin 120 ff.; French by Chézy in JA 1823, II, 39 ff.; German by Hoefer, Indische Gedichte II, 129 ff., and P. V. Bohlen, Das alte Indien, Königsberg 1830, 380 ff.; cf. Eggeling, Ind. off. Cat. VII, p. 1427 f.

4. Jahrbücher für Wissenschaftliche Kritik 1829, I, 521 ff. Some verses have also been translated into German. See also Rückert-Nachlese I, 217.

5. Ghaṭakarpara's name appears among the "nine jewels" of Vikramāditya (see above p. 46), a thing that in any case proves that the poem enjoyed certain reputation in India, as is shown also by its large number of commentaries (see Aufrecht CC s.v.). Nītisāra (Haeberlin 504 ff.) a collection 21 didactic stanzas, too is attributed to Ghaṭakarpara.

The famous Amaruśataka[1] or "The Hundred Stanzas", of the poet Amaru[2] must not have been altogether of an age very far from the time of Kālidāsa. Next to Kālidāsa there is hardly any lyric poet who is esteemed by Indians and is referred to as a model by poeticians as Amaru. Ānandavardhana in his poetics quotes the song-stanzas of Amaru as a proof that a poet can in single stanzas convey so much of sentiment that each of them appears like an independent poem in miniature[3]. And another teacher of poetics says: "A single stanza of the poet Amaru equals a hundred great poems". A proof of the popularity of Amaru's "Hundred"[4] is also the uncertainty of its text. The four recensions deviate from one another in the matter of the number of verses and their order of sequence. Besides we find in anthologies verses of Amaru that are not found in our śataka, whilst conversely verses of our Amaruśataka are attributed to other poets in anthologies[5].

About the time of Amaru we know nothing except that Ānandavardhana (about 850 A.D.) refers to him first of all by

1. The name occurs also in the forms Amaruka, Amarū, Amarūka.

2. R. Simon (Kiel 1893) has edited the Amaruśataka in its different recensions with an introduction and extracts from commentaries. Its supplement in ZDMG 49, 1895, 577 ff. Published with the commentary of Arjunadeva in Km. 18. [An edition with Hindi translation and commentary, Bombay 1914].

3. Dhvanyāloka III, 7 (Jacobi's German transl. p. 81 f.)

4. The actual number of verses in MSS and in commentaries varies between 90 and 115. The Km. edition has 102 strophes, and there are 7 pariśiṣṭas, containing further 61 verses, that have been collected partly from commentaries and MSS and partly from Alaṅkāraśāstras and anthologies. [See S. K. De, Padyāvalī. p. 184].

5. Only 51 verses are common to all the recensions. None of them is in a position to claim to contain the original text. Simon has based his edition on the text of the South Indian recension just on practical grounds. According to Aufrecht (ZDMG 27, 7 f.) the verses composed in the Śārdūlavikrīḍita metre only belong to the original collection; but there are only 61 stanzas, among those that are there, that have this metre (in Rec. I and III). H. Weller believes (according to a private communication) to have been able to prove that the rec. III is the earliest. That was the view of Bühler (ZDMG 47, 1893, p. 94), since this rec. is attested by the oldest commentator Arjunavarman (between 1215 and 1218). [The different recensions are:—South Indian (Comm. Vemabhūpāla and Rāmānandanātha); Bengal (Ravicandra); West Indian that was used by Arjunavarman; and the mixed recension (Rāmarudra, Rudramadeva). For specimens, with translation, see S. K. De Treatment of Love in Sans. Lit., Calcutta 1929, p. 28 f.; HSL, pp. 158 ff. C. R. Narasiṁha Śarmā—Studies in Sanskrit Literarure, Mysore, 1936 pp. 1-30.]

his name, whilst Vāmana (Circa 800) cites a verse from Amaruśataka[1] without naming its author. Almost nothing is known about the biography of Amaru. A tale narrated by some of the commentators and by the author of the so-called biography of Śaṅkara (Śaṅkaradigvijaya) goes to say that the real writer of the Amaruśataka is nobody other than the famous Vedānta philosopher Śaṅkara. It is said there that with the help of magic he entered into the body of the Kashmiri king Amaru and had intercourse with the latter's hundred wives for the purpose of gaining first-hand knowledge of modes of love. As a proof of his knowledge of the science of erotics, he composed the śataka[2]. In the opinion of W. this tale is historical to the extent that it suggests that Amaru was a resident of Kashmir (as meant by S i m o n), as a king of the name of Amaru is wholly unknown there.

In the way the Sattasaī of Hāla is the chief work of Prākrit love lyric, we can consider the Amaruśataka as the main work of erotic lyric of Sanskrit. The common feature of the Amaruśataka and Sattasaī is that every individual stanza is a complete poem in itself in both of them. It is a thing that properly holds good for the whole of Indian lyric and didactic poetry, including works like Meghadūta or Ṛtusaṁhāra, where a long series of several stanzas is expressive of a single idea. This is especially the case with the śatakas or "centuries", that is to say, in collections of stanzas counted in hundreds[3]. Like the lyric strophes of the Sattasaī, those of the Amaruśataka too are in majority of cases miniature p a i n t i n g s from amorous life, however, in an environment that is quite different from the one that we have known from the Sattasaī. But as there, so here too, the talk is about separation and parting, about

1. Amaru 16, 30 (II. Rec.) and 89 in Vāmana III, 2, 4; IV, 3, 12, V, 2, 8.

2. Ravicandra, the author of the commentary Kāmadā, attempts to prove the authorship of the great philosopher even by explaining the verses as having two meanings, and that in addition to the erotic sense, each of them has also a theosophical idea conveyed in it. This commentary was published in Calcutta 1808. Cf. K a t h a v a t e, Report p. 14; E g g e l i n g, Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1520 ff.

3. It is not correct to speak about a "Śataka lyric" or about "Centurian poetry" (see S i m o n, loc. cit p. 1f.; P i s c h e l, KG., p. 204). Since such a work is not characteristically composed of hundred stanzas there are poetical works with a smaller or greater number of strophes in them; but they are poems written insingle stanzas.

grievances and resentment; more frequently, however, it is about wilful surrender and affectionate embraces. The lays of Amaru have become considerably known [in Germany] through translations. Friedrich R ü c k e r t has already translated into German a portion of it under the title "38 Liedchen von Amaru."[1] Very often these songs have later evoked the talents of translators. A small selection is given below as a representation of the character of these poems:—

tadvaktrābhimukhaṁ mukhaṁ vinamitaṁ dṛṣṭiḥ kṛtā pādayos
tasyālāpakutūhalākulatare śrotre niruddhe mayā ।
pāṇibhyāṁ ca tiraskṛtaḥ sapulakaḥ svedodgamo gaṇḍayoḥ
sakhyaḥ kiṁ karavāṇi yānti śatadhā yatkañcuke saṁdhayaḥ ॥

"I bend down my face, that was opposite to his face; I cast my gance at his two feet; I close my two ears that remain anxious to listen to his words; I hide with my two hands the drops of sweat (gathering) on the temples of my two cheeks: O, friend, what can I do, since the knots in my upper garment get loose hundred times ?"

This according to the German translation of R ü c k e r t will be rendred as—

"Opposite to his face, shying I send my glance to his feet;
I close the ears that are pining for the pleasure of his embrace;
I cover with my hands the sweat that oozes in showers from the cheek;
O friend, what can I do when each knot in my bodice is bursting ?"

śūnyaṁ vāsagṛhaṁ vilokya śayanādutthāya kiñcitkṣaṇair-
nidrāvyājamupāgatasya suciraṃ nirvarṇya patyurmukham ।
visrabdhaṁ paricumbya jātapulakāmālokya gaṇḍasthalīṁ
lajjānamramukhī priyeṇa hasatā bālā ciraṁ cumbitā ॥

1. In Wendtschen Musenalmanach for the year 1831, p. 127 ff., Rückert-Nachlese I, 242 ff., 270.

2. Selected strophes have been translated into German by L. V. S c h r o e d e r , Mangoblüten, p. 77 ff; by H e r t e l , Indische Gedichte, and by Hans L i n d a c h (Pseud. Hermann W e l l e r),in the Lande der Nymphäen, Bilder us Indiens Liebesleben nach Amaru, Strassburg, and Leipzig 1908. The complete collection also in B ö h t l i n g k's "Indischen Sprüchen". L. V. S c h r o e d e r , Reden und Aufsätze, Leipzig 1913, p. 158 ff. gives a beautiful appreciation of the lyrics of Amaru.

This according to the German translaton of Shroeder will be rendered as:—

"She is alone with him in the sleeping chamber,
The young wife finds her husband slumbering;
She gently rises up from her bed and looks at his face
For a long time, while he poses as fast asleep,
And now she kisses him gently again and again ;
And when little hairs on her cheek stand erect
On account of rupture and she gets ashamed,
He raises his face, raises up the head
And smiles and kisses her again and again for long."

sā patyuḥ prathamāparādhasamaye sākhyopadeśaṁ vinā
no jānāti savibhramāṅgavalanāvakroktisaṁsūcanam ।
svacchairacchakapolamūlagalitiaḥ paryastanetrotpalā
bālā kevalameva roditi luṭhallolākairaśrubhiḥ ॥

"The young girl, on the occasion of the first offence committed by her husband, because of no advice from her friend, knows not to give expression (to her feeling of grief) by particular manner of movement of the limbs and by talking in a figurative language; (so) she just breaks into tears that drop from the root of her bright cheeks and are white with her rollingly moving hairs, and her eyes look like widespread lotuses."

But according to the German translation of Leopold von Schroeder it is to be rendered as :—

"When for the first time, utters an offending word,
The husband, then begin to tremble violently
The limbs of the young wife; but still she knows not
To utter a single biting word—nor does she inform
Any of her friends about the matter;
She just casts her anxious lotus-eyes all round,
And her bright cheeks get covered
With white tears and shaking hairs."

bhrūbhaṅge racitepi dṛṣṭiradhikaṁ sotkaṇṭhamudvīkṣate
ruddhāyāmapi vāci sasmitapadaṁ dagdhānanaṁjāyate ।
kārkaśyaṁ gamitepi cetasi tanū romāñcamālambate
dṛṣṭe nirvahaṇaṁ bhaviṣyati kathaṁ mānasya tasmiñjane ॥

"Even after the brows have been wrinkled, the eye gazes anxiously more and more; though speech is stopped, the cursed face looks smiling; even though the mind is hardened, the body ripples : (at the time) when that fellow is seen, how can the anger come to an end ?"

But according to the German translation of Leopold von Schroeder:—

"She wrinkles her brows, but alas, the eyes
Still thirst eagerly for the beloved ;
She keeps silent and does not utter a word,
But her face, even though aggrieved,
Presents a most graceful smiling appearance;
She tries to harden her heart, but the skin
Of her whole body begins to ripple;
She tries to appear sulky; still when she sees
Him standing face to face,
How can she make that come to end ?"

Further

mugdhe mugdhatayaiva netumkhilaḥ kālaḥ kimārabhyate
mānaṁ dhatsva dhṛtiṁ badhāna ṛjutāṁ dūre kuru preyasi ।
sakhyaivaṁ pratibodhitā prativacastāmāha bhītānanā
nīcaiḥ śaṁsa hṛdi sthito hi nanu me prāṇeśvaraḥ śroṣyati ॥

"O innocent girl, why have you begun to spend all (your) time in innocence ? Show anger, please hold patience, cast off straight-forwardness in (respect of your) beloved. When (she) was thus advised by her friend, she with a terrified face replied—

"Please speak in a slow voice; the lord of (my) life, living in my heart, will hear it."

But according to the German translation of J. J. Meyer (Kāvyasaṁgraha, p. 20 f.) [1]

Ah, my innocent child,
Away with your innocence,
You know not, what sort of men are,
Have trust in my age,
Please be sulky towards your sweet'heart,
You most show yourself as hard :

[1. This stanza does not occur in Kāvyasaṁgraha, part II, where the Amaruśataka is printed at pages 20 f.].

This is usual in love.
In case you do this, he will remain your own."
Terrified by this she shouted—
"O my friend, please speak in a low voice,
Otherwise my husband stationed in my heart,
Will hear all this."

Further—
kānte sāgasi śāpite priyasakhīveśaṁ vidhyāyāgate
bhrāntyāliṅgya mayā rahasyamuditaṁ tatsaṅgamākāṅkṣayā ।
mugdhe duṣkarametadityatitamāmuddāmahāsaṃ balād
āśliṣyacchalitāsmi tena kitavenādya pradoṣāgame ॥

"When I cursed my sweet'heart and he came in the guise of (my) intimate friend, I by mistake embraced him and told him my desire for meeting him. 'O innocent girl, that is difficult'—saying this, with a very thundering laughter, he forcibly embraced me. So I have been cheated by that wicked fellow at the advent of the evening to-day."

But according to the German translation of Hans Lindach:

"I had my love farewell
After a quarrel in love;
Then the wicked fellow came back to me
In the guise of my friend;
With him within my arms,
I divulged the secret of my heart—
That I was longing to be by him.
Then spoke he, "My child, that is really difficult";
He kissed me and embraced me long.
Thus he has played trick with me
Today , after the setting of the sun."

The testimony of Ānandavardhana seems to prove that there was actually a poet whose name was Amaru. Thereby it too becomes certain that with the help of the musical stanzas of Amaruśataka we have obtained the impression of a detailed description of the physiognomy of the poet. If this be not the case, we have to consider the Amaruśataka, as many researchers believe, as nothing but an anthology of musical stanzas composed by many different poets.

We know about the greater portion of Indian love-lyrics only from the anthologies, in which there occur numerous stanzas of even poets (and occasionally also of poetesses) who are otherwise unknown. One of the better known lyric poets is Mayūra, a contemporary of Bāṇa. He exhibits his accurate knowledge of Kāmaśāstra in his Mayūrāṣṭaka (Eight Stanzas by Mayūra)[1]. The story goes that in these verses Mayūra described the beauty of his daughter, the consort of Bāṇa, so minutely that she became very angry at her father and cursed him, and on account of this he became a leper. But later he was cured of this disease through the aid of the sun-god, whom he eulogized in his famous Sūryaśataka[2]. The (eight) verses contain the description of a beautiful young woman who has secretly visited her lover and returns back from his bed-chamber. The allusions to the wounds caused by scratches and bites as well as the words "even an old man becomes of Cupid" might probably have given currency to this story.

To the most famous love lyrics of India belongs the Caurīsuratapañcāśikā, "The Fifty Stanzas on Secret Amorous Sport"[3] of the Kashmirian poet Bilhaṇa. These are fifty stanzas, each of which begins with the words *adyāpi* "even to-day." The poet describes in them, with a glowing erotic the amorous pleasures that he enjoyed with a princess and

1. Edited and translated into English by G.P. Quackenbos in JAOS 31, 1911, 343 ff. and The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra (Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series), p. 67 ff. [See also F. E. Edgerton, American Journal of Philology, (38, 1917, 435 . ff.)]

2. See below p. 136.

3. Neither the title nor its meaning is certain. The titles Caurapañcāśikā and Corapañcāśat too occur. That would mean "Fifty Stanzas of the Thief, Caura or Cora". This has led people to think of a poet Caura or Cora as its author. This ostensible name of the poet occurs first of all in Jayadeva's Prasannarāghava. But there should be no doubt about Bilhaṇa's being this poet according to Bühler, (Report 48 f. and Vikramāṅkadevacarita, p. 24. However, the theme of the poem and its association with the tale that is told about it make it the more doubtful. The text of the Central Indian recension together with Bhartṛhari's centuries has been edited by P. v. Bohlen Berolini 1833, and in Haeberlin 227 ff. The fifty stanzas constitute just an enclosure in the South Indian recension, edited and translated by Ed. Ariel (JA 1848, s. 4, XI, 469 ff.) and in the small poem Bilhaṇacarita "Adventures of Bilhaṇa" that has been published in the Kāvyamāla, Part XIII, 1903, 145-169, wherein the story of Bilhaṇa's love with a princess is narrated, though differently in each of the two editions. In "Die Kaśmir-Recension der Pañcāśikā" the text has been critically discussed, edited and translated into German by W. Solf, Kiel 1886. Cf. also Jacobi in the Literaturblatt. für Orientalische Philologie III, 63 ff. and Winternitz in Oesterr Monatsschrift für den Orient 12, 1886, 155 ff.

presents the sensuous pictures. It is said that the poet was in secret love with the daughter of a king, and when this fact became public, he was ordered to be put to death. At the place fixed for his execution, with death facing him, he composed the 50 stanzas that pleased and impressed the king so much so that he set him free and gave him his daughter as a wife. That this tale[1] does not have any historical basis is mainly suggested by the fact that in his autobiography (see above p. 94) he does not say a word about having a princess as his wife. This view gets further support from the fact that in several versions of the tale, the story narrated is not that of Bilhaṇa, but of some other personages. The verses themselves just say that they have been composed about a princess[2], but thence we can deduce neither this that it deals with secret love nor this that the theme relates to the decision of the poet's being put to death[3]. The Kashmirian

1. The tale forms a part of the poem in the editions by Ariel and in Km. and is narrated in the commentaries too. The name of the princess, in the ed. Ariel is Yāminīpūrṇatilakā, daugher of the Pañcāla king Madanābhirāma; against this, the princess in the Km. edition is Śaśikalā, Candrakalā or Candralekhā (all the three meaning "digit of the moon"), a daughter of King Vīrasiṁha of Mahilapattana. Hence in the Km. edition also the title Candralekhāsakti Bilhaṇakāvya, "Bilhaṇa's Poem of his Affection for Candralekhā". In the MSS from Gujarat the beloved is one Caurā (i.e. Cauḍā or Cāpotkaṭā) princess. The commentator Gaṇapati, who, moreover, mentions Pañcāśikā as a "fragmentary poem (khaṇḍakāvya), speaks about a Brāhmaṇa Caura as a world-famous man, who had sensuous association with a princess. Perhaps this poem is actually a fragment of another poem, of which the theme was love between a thief (caura) and a princess, and in which the poet put the verses into the mouth of a thief brought to the place of execution. In a commentary, written in 1798, Rāma Tarkavāgīśa Bhaṭṭācārya explains the stanzas as constituting an invocation to the goddess Kālikā of a prince Sundara, son of Guṇasāgara of Caurapallī, who composed it before King Vīrasiṁha, while he was awaiting his sentence of death on account of his secret association with Vidyā, the daughter of the king. When the king heard the poem, induced by Kālikā, he offered him his daughter for the purpose of making her his wife. Cf. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. VII, p. 1524 f. In the edition Haeberlin Sundara is mentioned as the author.

In the Bengali poem Vidyāsundara of Bhāratacandra, the chief court-poet of Rāja Kṛṣṇacandra (18th century), the story of love that existed between Princess Vidyā and Prince Sundara is narrated, and here Sundara describes in stanzas (that correspond to the stanzas of the Caurīpañcāśikā) his love for Vidyā. The verses, however, are capable of being interpreted in two different ways and being taken simply as constituting a prayer-hymn to the goddess Kālī. Cf. Dineśa Candra Sen, History of Bengali Language and Literature, p. 650. f.

2. The stanza 37 (Solf), where the theme is regarding the princess, occurs in all the recensions.

3. Verse 48 (Solf), where the poet says that "even to-day in the hour of his death he has his mind absorbed in love" is wanting in the South Indian recension and perhaps is not relevant even on other grounds (see Jacobi loc. cit.).

recension has two introductory stanzas, of which the second one appears to be the poet's words of farewell to his life in which he says that he will never return back when he will have once fallen in the net of coquettish glances of the wives of gods[1].

Just as doubtful as the frame, in which "the Fifty Stanzas" are to be fitted, is also the text of the poem that has suffered further worse in the hands of the copyists than any other popular work of Indian poetry. Of the fifty verses only seven are to be found in all the three chief recensions. Since the poet was of Kashmir and lived in the court of a South Indian ruler, each of the stanzas that are common to the South Indian and Kashmirian recensions should have at the most a claim to be genuine. There are 34 such verses. This great difference in recensions is, in any case, a proof of extraordinary popularity of the poem in India. And also from the stand'point of Indian sensuality the fame of this poem is easily understandable[2]. For the taste of the people of the West, the translators had to make the poem palatable by considerably toning down the ardour permeating Indian the verses[3].

To the 11th century A.D. belongs also the Āryāsaptaśatī[4], "Seven Hundred Āryā Verses" of the poet Govar-

1. This verse, however, stands in opposition to the preceding one, in which the poet tells his enemies—'happiness and fame will again soon get into his house'. The difficulties that are created by these two stanzas have been removed neither by Bühler, nor by Solf, nor by Jacobi. [S. K. De, HSL p. 369 is of the opinion that "Bilhaṇa's authorship can be asserted with as little confidence as that of Cora (in spite of Jayadeva's mention of a poet of that name in the Prasannarāghava) or of Sundara. It is, on the other hand, not improbable that the stanzas were old floating verses of forgotten authorship, which were ascribed to Bilhaṇa, Cora, Sundara and Vararuci in turn, and different legendary frame-stories were supplied."]

2. Krishnamacharya p. 122 says that in India even to this day the poem is liked so much that no Indian child fails to commit to memory at least some of these stanzas. In the West people will not like to place the poem in the hands of a young person.

3. So Hoefer, Indische Gedichte I, 117 ff., in his very free complete German translation and L. V. Schroeder, who (Mangoblüten, p. 61 ff.) has reproduced in German a number of selected stanzas more beautifully but more freely. The Latin translation of v. Bohlen and the literal German translation of Solf cannot naturally present any poetical beauty of the peom. [Eng. trans. Edwin Arnold, London 1896 and E. Powys Mathers, Oxford 1919; Ital. transl. G. de Lorenzo, Il canto del ladro, Napoli 1925.]

4. Edited with Ananta Paṇḍita's, commentary written in 1624, in Km. 1, 1886. Cf. Weber. Foreword to his edition of Hāla's Saptaśataka, p. xxvi f., and Pischel, HL, p. 30 f.

dhana. The author is a contemporary of the famous Jayadeva, who says about him that nobody can surpass master Govardhana in excellent erotic descriptions. The poet boasts about himself (v. 52) that he has carried over to Sanskrit by force the type of poetry that usually found tasteful expression in Prākrit, in the same manner as Balarāma raised up into the sky the Yamunā, of which the water was suitable for a low plain. By this he means to say that upto his time the erotic poetry composed in the Āryā metre was brought to perfection and was usually cultured in Prākrit, and it was he who introduced it into Sanskrit. In fact his task was to write in Sanskrit a work that could throw into dark the fame of Hāla's Sattasaī by composing 700 stanzas in the Āryā metre with erotic themes, that are related in no way with one another and have been arranged by him in an alphabetic order (according to the initial letters). His task might have been more difficult than that of Hāla; but the Āryāsaptaśatī, lacking in popularity, cannot be compared with the Sattasaī. However, the work of Govardhana was the model on which the poet Bihārī Lāl composed in the Hindī language his Sat'saī, of which, the verses, in the opinion of Grierson[1], "show the charm and elegance of language, on account of which Kālidāsa would have envied him": and again this Hindī work has been imitated by a Sanskrit poet Paramānanda "in one Śṛṅgārasaptatikā.

By the side of the erotic lyrics moved along also the old religious lyric and in addition to the large number of hymns dedicated to Sūrya, Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa, Rāma, Śiva, Durgā and other divinities that we find in the purāṇas and tantras, there are many pieces that are really ornate poetry. Many of these stotras are wholly philosophical, particularly containing ideas of the Vedānta; and often it is impossible to distinguish whether a work is to be included in the purāṇa and tantra literature or among the philosophical texts or in ornate poetry. Side by side with numberless prayers and litanies, that very often are nothing but invocations to and names of gods, besides in many prayers that are, however, small in number and appear as expression of a deep religious ardour, there occur numerous ornate poems in which the most

1. JRAS 1894, p. 110.

difficult metres and all the devices of poetics have come into play. The divinities too were believed to be won over better by use of rare and most difficult figures of speech. Most of these stotras probably are of recent origin Frequently they have the form of śatakas or "centuries".

One of the oldest poem of this type is the C a ṇ ḍ ī ś a t a k a [1], "Hundred stanzas dedicated to C a ṇ ḍ ī", by the poet B ā ṇ a. In 102 stanzas (almost all in the Sragdharā metre) the consort of Śiva, with her different names, one of which is Caṇḍī, and particularly her foot, with which she killed the demon, Mahiṣa, having the form of a buffalo, is praised and glorified. In each of the verses occurs at the end the benedictory formula "may she protect you", *sāvatādambikā vaḥ*. Famous is also the S ū r y a ś a t a k a [2], "Hundred Strophes dedicated to the Sun-god" by M a y ū r a, a contemporary of Bāṇa[3], written likewise in the Sragdharā metre and in the same ornate style as the Caṇḍīśataka. In the poem, the rays, the horses, the charioteer, the chariot and the orb of the sun are praised one after another. The rays of the sun are the "ships by which man crosses the terrible ocean of rebirths, the origin of prolonged pains," the orb of the sun is the door of freedom, and the sun himself is the supporter of men and gods and upholder of the entire world-order, and is one with Brahman, Viṣṇu and Śiva (verses 9, 73, 87, 99). In verse 50 Aruṇa, the charioteer of Sūrya, is compared to a stage-manager, who recites the prologue at the time of performance of a show. From the citations in manuals

1. Edited with commentary in Km., Part IV, 1 ff. Cf. above II, 340 (transl., p. 550) and B ü h l e r, Ind. Ant. 1, 1872, 111 ff. Text with English translation by Q u a c k e n b o s, The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra... together with the Text and Translation of Bāṇa's Caṇḍīśataka, pp. 243-357.

2. Edited in Haeberlin 197 ff., and with commentary in Km. 19, 1889; with English translation of Q u a c k e n b o s, The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra, p. 81 ff. On "Sanna" or a literal rendering of the Sūryaśataka, composed in Cylon cf. R h y s D a v i d s in JRAS, 1894, p. 555. [See above p. 132. Italian trans. by C. B e r h h e i m e r. Livorno 1905.]

3. We learn from Bāṇa's Harṣacarita too that Harṣa's father and his predecessors were sun-worshippers; hence it is very probable that Mayūra was an older contemporary of Bāṇa. Cf B ü h l e r, Die indischen Inschriften, usw. p 14 ff; P e t e r s o n, Subh. p. 86; Z a c h a r i a e, Bezz. Beitr. 13, 1888, p. 100. The Sūryaśataka has been quoted by Ānandavardhana. One Khaṇḍapraśasti of Mayūra is cited by Ruyyaka. But one Khaṇḍapraśasti (a poem on Viṣṇu's incarnations), edited in the Pandit V, VI, is attributed to the monkey Hanūmat.

of poetics and in anthologies it is concluded that the Sūryaśataka is held in a higher esteem than the Caṇḍiśataka[1].

The authorship of a large number of hymns dedicated to Śiva or to Devī, the Divine Mother or to Viṣṇu too is attributed to the celebrated philosopher Śaṅkara[2]. Probably many of these hymns are really his own, and perhaps "a great majority of them are wrongly attributed to him. Some of such hymns are dedicated to Devī, i.e. "goddess" par excellence or the "Mother", an appallation by which she is referred to by the Śāktas. In the cult of this sect the divine principle is not conceived as masculine, but as feminine; and the Śāktas believe that the most exhaulted creative principle cannot be most appropriately designated by the word "Father", but by the word "Mother". All the mythological feminine forms, above all, the consort of the god Śiva, who is praised and worshipped under numberless names like Umā, Pārvatī, Durgā, Caṇḍī, etc. as the "Mother of the Universe" (Jaganmātā) are revered by adherents of this sect as the divine "Mother"[3]. It is comprehensible that when the Indian poets refer to divinity as their "Mother" they utter the word from the core of their heart. It is why we find among these hymns, dedicated to Devī, many of the best pieces of religious lyrics. As examples, a few stanzas from the Devyaparādhakṣamāpaṇa, "Prayer to Devī for Atonement of Sins", attributed to Śaṅkara, are given below:—

vidherajñānena draviṇavirahenālasatayā
vidheyāśakyatvāttava caraṇayoryā cyutirabhūt ।
tadetatkṣantavyaṁ janani sakaloddhāriṇi śive
kuputro jāyeta kvacidapi kumātā na bhavati ॥

"Either on account of ignorance of thy command,
Or on account of poverty or idleness,

---

1. Cf. Quackenbos, ibid 98 ff. The Sāmbapañcāśikā (in Km. 13, 1889), ascribed to a poet Sāmba, is a poem devoted to the sun-cult and is of unknown antiquity. The name of the son of Lord Kṛṣṇa too was Sāmba, who is mentioned in the purāṇas in relation to the sun-cult. There is also one Sāmba-upapurāṇa. It is questionable whether Sāmba is actually the name of a poet.

2. See also a collection of eight such hymns with English translation contained in S. Venkataramanan, Select Works of Sri Sankaracharya, Madras.

3. Cf. on this sect Winternitz, Die Tantras und die Religion der Śāktas, Ostasiatische Zeitschrift IV, 1916, p. 153 ff. A collection of hymns dedicated to Devī has been translated into English by Arthur and Ellen Avalon: Hymns to the Goddess, London, 1913.

Or because I did not have the strength to follow thy command;
In whatever manner I erred in respect of thy feet;
O kind Mother, that freeth from all bonds,
May'st thou forgive all that
Many a time, it is true, a bad son is born,
But a bad mother, there is none and never."

pṛthivyāṁ putrāste janani bahavaḥ santi saralāḥ
paraṁ teṣāṁ madhye viralataralohaṁ tava sutaḥ ।
madīyoyaṁ tyāgaḥ samucitamidaṁ no tava śive
kuputro jāyeta kvacidapi kumātā na bhavati ॥
"Mother, thou hast many worthy sons on the earth;
But among them, I am one without worth;
Still, O Mother, thou can'st give me up :
A bad son is many a time born,
But a bad mother, there is none and never."

jaganmātarmātastava caraṇasevā na racitā
na vā dattaṁ devi draviṇamapi bhūyastava mayā ।
tathāpi tvaṁ snehaṁ mayi nirupamaṁ yatprakuruṣe
kuputro jāyeta kvcidapi kumātā na bhavati ॥
"Mother of the universe, I have not served thy feet,
Nor have I offered thee rich wealth;
Notwithstanding this, that thou showeth
Affection, that is incomparable, towards me:
A bad son is many a time born,
But a bad mother, there is none and never."

Of the hymns that are ascribed to Śaṅkara and dedicated to Devī, a mention should be made of Bhavānyaṣṭaka[1], "Eight Stanzas to (the goddess of the name) Bhavānī", with the refrain "thou art my shelter, thou alone art my shelter, Bhavānī, and Ānandalaharī[2], "Wave of Happiness" in 20 Śikhariṇī stanzas deserve to be mentioned here.

1. Edited and tranlated into German by A. Hoefer, Sanskrit Lesebuch, Berlin 1849, p. 93 ff.; Ind. Gedichte II, 157 ff.

2. Edited and translated into French by A. Troyer, JA 1841, s. 3, XII, 273 ff., 401 ff. Text also in Haeberlin 246 ff.; translated into English by Avalon, Hymns to the Goddess, 62 ff. Other hymns to Devī, published in Km., Part IX, 1893, 114 ff. 140 ff.; Part XI, 1895 ff.; the Ambāṣṭaka, "Eight Stanzas to the Mother" with a commentary in Km.,

M ū k a might have been a contemporary of Śaṅkara. He has praised Devī in not less than 500 stanzas, P a ñ c a ś a t ī[1]. Ānandavardhana wrote also a D e v ī ś a t a k a[2], hundred highly ornate stanzas, in which he exhibits his mastery over the most complex artifices of poetics, a thing that is contradictory to his own view that suggestion and not embellishment is the essential thing in poetry. At one place in his poetics, however, he says that in prayers to gods the sentiment (rasa) is of minor importance[3]. U t p a l a d e v a , the teacher of Abhinavagupta, wrote (in the beginning of the 10th century) one S t o t r ā v a l ī[4], a collection 20 stanzas written in praise of Śiva, that contains partly simple invocations and partly fully ornate verses. Before the 11th century A.D. must have lived the Vaiṣṇava saint K u l a ś e k h a r a , who wrote one M u k u n d a m ā l ā[5] for the purpose of glorification of Viṣṇu, in which for example he says:—

divi vā bhuvi vā mamāstu vāso
narake vā narakāntaka prakāmam ।
avadhīritaśāradāravin dau
caraṇau te maraṇepi cintayāmi ॥

"Whether in the heaven, or on the earth,
Wherever I may live;
Whether in hell, whatever the place be,
O ender of hell, even in the hour of death, may I think

Part II, 1886, 154 ff.; the Pañcastavī (Five Hymns to Durgā of unknown authors) in Km., Part III, pp. 9-31. The hymns addressed to Śiva have been published in Haeberlin 496 ff., and Km., Part VI, 1890, 1 ff.; hymns to Viṣṇu in Km. Part II, 1886, 1 ff.

1. Edited in Km., Part V, 1888, 1 ff., where Mūka is mentioned as a modern poet. According to K r i s h n a m a c h a r y a 119, traditionally he was a contemporary of Śaṅkara; he was an idiot (mūka) in his youth and became a great poet through a sudden inspiration.

2. Edited in Km. Part IX, 1893, 1 ff. with the commentary of K a y y a ṭ a , written in the year 978 (see H u l t s c h , Kalidasa's Meghaduta, p. IX.)

3. Cf. J a c o b i , Ā n a n d a v a r d h a n a s D h v a n y ā l o k a , Separ., p. 137 f. (on III, 43).

4. Edited with the commentary of Kṣemarajā in Chowkhambhā Sanskr. Series No 15, Benaras 1902. On the author see A u f r e c h t CC 64 and T h o m a s , Kav. 29f. In the 14th century A.D. Jagaddhara wrote his 38 hymns in praise of Śiva: S t u ṭ i k u s u m ā ñ j a l i , Bouquet of Prayer of Songs" (edited with commentary in Km. 23, 1891).

5. Edited in Haeberlin 515 ff. (22 verses), another recension (34 verses) in Km.; Part 1, 11 ff. One verse (Haeberlin 7, Km. 6) is cited in an inscription of Pagan (13th century A.D.); see H u l t z s c h, Ep. Ind. 7, 197.

Only about thy feet, that outshine
The lotuses of the autumn."

In the 11th century Bilvamaṅgala wrote his Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta, "Nectar for Kṛṣṇa's Ears", 110 stanzas on the glorification of Kṛṣṇa, a poem that in India is held in great esteem[1]. In about the middle of the 16th century A.D. Rūpadeva Vidyābhūṣaṇa, commonly called Rūpa Gosvāmin, a follower of Caitanya, wrote his songs in praise of Kṛṣṇa, Stavamālā[2] and also Mukunda muktāvalī[3].

In about 1540 A.D. the astronomer and poet Sūrya deva or Sūrya, son of Sugaṇaka Jñānādhirāja, wrote his Rāmakṛṣṇakāvya, a pòem that can be read both from the top and the bottom (vilomākṣarakāvya), and in which Rāma and Kṛṣṇa have been extolled in different hemistichs. There is a commentary on the work written by the poet himself[4].

The Nārāyaṇīya of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa[5], completed in the year 1590 A.D. is a stotra and fairly extensive kāvya at the same time. The poem contains the entire subject-matter of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and consists of ten decades (daśakas[6]). In Kerala it has the value of a prayer-book like the Bhāgavata, and pious people read a section from it everyday. The legend goes that the poet was a Brāhmaṇa of Kerala, suffering from rheumatism and was cured of this disease with the help of his prayers to Kṛṣṇa. At the completion of recitation of each of its decades he was healed of one-tenth of his malady[7].

1. The title is also Kṛṣṇalīlāmṛta, and the poet is called also Līlāśuka: according to a legend he was reborn as Jayadeva, the author of the Gītagovinda, see Aufrecht, Bodl. Cat. 128 and Krishnamacharya 121 f., who says that the poem is daily sung by young people and many verses are very much suitable for dance.

2. Edited with commentary in Km. 84, 1903; see Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1497 f.

3. Edited in Km., Part II, 1886, 157 ff.; see Ind. Off. Cat., p. 1469 f. To Kṛṣṇa is addressed also Ānandamandākinī written in the 15th century by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, published in the Pandit N. S. 1, 498 ff. and in Km. Part II, 1886, 138 ff.

4. Edited in Haeberlin 463 ff. and Km., Part XI, 1895, 147 ff.

5. Edited with the commentary of Gaṇapati Śastrī in TSS No. 18, 1912.

6. Beside the division into decades there are 12 skandhas in the decades, and this goes to make it a kind of purāṇa.

7. Cf. also the legend of Mānatuṅga, Mayūra and Bāṇa, above II, 340; transl. 550.

In the 17th century Rāmabhadra-Dīkṣita composed his different hymns in the highest kāvya-style, in which he has praised the arrows of Rāma, Rāmacāpastava., Rāmabāṇastava and Aṣṭaprāsa or Rāmāṣṭaprāsa; further in one Varṇamālāstotra, written in 51 stanzas in a very simple language with their first letters arranged alphabetically Rāma has been praised[1]. In the same century Jagannātha flourished as a lyric writer. He sang in praise of Lakṣmī in the Lakṣmīlaharī[2] and Gaṅgā in the Gaṅgālaharī[3] and composed in 30 literary stanzas a hymn to the sun, the Sudhālaharī[4]. Rāmabhadra's teacher Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita wrote a philosophical work Ānandasāgarastava in a simple dignified language in praise of the Devī[5].

The peculiar manner in which the Devī-cult came to flourish is shown by a poem of unknown antiquity, the Caṇḍīkucapañcāśikā, "50 Stanzas on the Breasts of Caṇḍī" by a poet Lakṣmaṇa Ācārya, son of Beṇīmādhava[6]. A half-religious and half-erotic is the peom Bhikṣāṭanakāvya of Śivadāsa, who calls himself Utprekṣāvallabha. In this poem the writer describes the feelings and reaction of the female devotees of Śiva when he goes about in the garb of a holy mendicant[7].

1. Published in Km., Part XII, 1897, 1 ff.; Part X, 1894, 18 ff. and Part XIII, 1903, 1 ff. Rāmabhadra, a disciple of Nīlakaṇṭha was also a dramatist, see Krishnamacharya, p. 110.

2. Published in Km. part II, 1886, 104 ff.

3. Jagannātha is said to have married a Muhammadan girl, and on account of this he was excommunicated. One day he with his wife sat on the highest (52nd) step of a ghaṭṭa on a bank of the Gaṅgā and began to pray to the holy river. With completion of each stanza the river continued to rise. When he recited the 52nd stanza the water of the river reached him and his consort and washed off their sin. They were drowned in the river and were never seen again. The poem, Gaṅgālaharī, however, is well-known in the whole of India. Cf. R. L. Vaidya, Bhāminīvilāsa Ed., Introduc. p. 12 ff., Aufrecht, Leipzig, No. 441. Amṛtalaharī, edited in the Km., Part I, p. 99 ff. is a poem written in praise of Yamunā; The Karuṇālaharī, published in Km. Part II, p. 55 ff. sings the miseries of human fate.

4. Edited in Km., part I, 16 ff.

5. Edited in Km., Part XI, 1895, 76 ff.

6. Edited in Km., Part IX, 1893, 80 ff. Notwithstanding the title the poem contains 83 verses; verses 1-18 form the introduction and 69-83 constitute the conclusion.

7. Cf. Aufrecht, ZDMG, 27, 12 f.; Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. p., 1448 f.

In India erotic and religious lyrics seem to have got mixed up together. The most famous religious erotic poem is the Gītagovinda[1] of Jayadeva, the son of Bhojadeva of Kindubilva (modern Kendulī) in Bengal, the court-poet of Lakṣmaṇasena. The Bhaktamāla[2], a book of legends of the followers of the Kṛṣṇa-cult, written in the Hindī language, contains about the poet several legends, in which he is extolled as a saint and miracle-worker[3]. In his youth he led the life of a wandering ascetic, but is said to have married later when a Brāhmaṇa forced upon him his daughter. In the status of a married man he composed the poem Gītagovinda, in which Lord Kṛṣṇa aided him to describe the loveliness of Rādhā, when his mortal powers failed. The complete title of the poem is Gītagovindakāvyam, i.e. "the poem, in which Govinda is extolled through songs." Govinda is the name of the cowherd god Kṛṣṇa,

1. Cf. Pischel, HL, p. 19 ff. Editions: Gita Givinda, Jayadevae Poetae Indici drama lyricum. Taxtum ... recognovit ... interpretationem latinam adjectit C. Lassen, Bonnae ad Rh. 1836. The Gīta-Govinda of Jayadeva with the Commentries Rasikapriyā of King Kumbha and Rasamañjarī of Mahāmahopādhyāya Śaṅkaramiśra. Ed. M. R. Telang and W. L. S. Paṇsīkar, 3rd Ed., Bombay 1910, NSP. An English translation by W. Jones had already appeared in the Asiatic Researches, 3, 184ff. The last-named one gave rise to the German rendering by F. H. v. Dalberg. (Erfurt 1802), F. Majer (in the Asiat. Magazin II, 294 ff.) and A. W. Riemenschneider (Halle 1818). A German translation by F. Rückert (first of all made in 1829 according to a Calcutta impression and then recast according to Lassen's edition) appeared in Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes I, Göttingen 1837, p. 128 ff., (in addition to philological notes, p. 286 ff.) also in Rückert-Nachlese I, 346 ff. Recently it has been published in the Insel-Bücherei No. 303 The work, that has appeared under the title "Frühlingsliebe von Reinhard Wogen leicht übersetzt aus dem indischen Gitagowinda des Dschajadewa" Halle a. S. 1911, is worthless. The best representation of the original is given by the French translation by G. Courtillier (avec une préface de S. Lévi, Paris 1904). On the large number of commentaries on the Gītagovinda see Ind. Off. Cat. VII, p. 1454 ff. [Translated into Dutch by B. Faddegon, Santpoovt 1932. See Keith, HSL, 190 ff.; S. K. De, HSL, p. 388ff.: Eng. transl. by Edwin Arnold. The Indian Song of Songs, London 1875; French transl. also by H. Fouché, Paris 1850.]

[2. Written by W. as Bhakta Mālā.]

3. These legends were communicated by H. H. Wilson, Works, 1, 65 ff. and E. Trumpp, Die ältesten Hinduī-Gedichte (SBay. A. 1879, I), p. 6 ff. There occurs also a small Hindī poem of Jayadeva in text and in translation, which is the oldest poem in the Ādigrantha. The poetical part of the Bhaktamāla was written by Nabhaji towards the end of the 16th century A.D. Cf. also M. Chakravarti, JASB N. S. 2, 1906, 163 ff. who reports a story from the Sanskrit Bhaktamālā of Candradatta. [See also Garcin de Tassy, Histoire de la Littérature Hindoue et Hindoustanie, Paris, 1870 II, 69 ff. and Grierson, Modern Vernacular Literature of Hindustan, Calcutta, 1889, Section 51.]

and the theme of the poem consists of his love for Rādhā, who keeps herself aloof from him on account of jealousy, the longing of the loving pair and their final entreaties and reconciliations. The simple activity, if it can be so called is narrated in a few recitative verses, whilst the main portion of the poem consists of rhyming dance-songs with a refrain[1]. The melody and cadence, according to which they are to be sung and that are to accompany the dance, are always given. These songs, that are alternately put into the mouths of Rādhā, her friend and Kṛṣṇa, describe in pictures full of sentient ardour the events and the sentiments. Here and there are inserted also benedictions, and in the concluding stanza of each song the name of the poet is mentioned, and it is said that he is a devotee of Hari[2]. The recitative verses that follow each of the songs—such verses number upto three—are not sung, but are to be recited in an artistic manner. They describe many a time the situation, and often the appearing person is further brought into the song. The narrative and the recitative parts have been interwoven in this work as can be seen by casting a glance at the contents of the first canto.

After a foreward in four stanzas by the poet, there is a hymn to Viṣṇu (Hari), in which the god has been extolled in his ten physical incarnations, and then follows a second hymn for the glorification of God with the refrain jaya jaya deva hare, "triumph to the Divine Hari". Then there is a narrative stanza that reports that while the confidante of Rādhā speaks to her, thereafter the song[3] follows, in which the confidante describes how Kṛṣṇa in the thicket rejoices in the company of cowherd-maidens and dances with them. Three recitative stanzas describe the spring and reports that Rādhā's friend once more addresses her in the follow-

1. Usually they have 8 strophes; therefore, in many manuscripts they are called Aṣṭapadī : and since these songs form the nucleus of the poem, the latter is often designated as Aṣṭapadī, i.e. "The Poem with 8 Strophes."

2. Since arbitrarily Rückert has omitted these religious accessories, his translation does not rightly represent the poem.

3. It is to be sung in the "Spring Melody", to which the notes were communicated by W. Jones (As. Res. 3, 86 f.). In India particular melodies are prescribed for particular seasons and particular time of the day. See J. D. Paterson. As. Res. 9, 1809, p. 454.

ing octaves: and this p r a b a n d h a describes how the cowherdesses are attracted towards the young god, crowd about him, admire him and allure him :

kāpi kapolatale militā lapituṁ śrutimūle ।
cāru cucumba nitambavatī dayitaṁ pulakairanukūle ॥
haririha mugdhavadhūnikare o ॥
kelikalākutukena ca kācidamuṁ yamunājalakūle ।
mañjulavañjulakuñjagataṁ vicakarṣa kareṇa dukūle ॥
haririha mugdhavadhūnikare o ॥
śliṣyati kāmapi cumbati kāmapi kāmapi ramayati rāmām ।
paśyati sasmitacārutarāmaparāmanugacchati vāmām ।
haririha mughdhavadhūnikare o ॥

"One young girl turns to the side of his cheek,
With a desire to whisper something into his ear;
She kisses her sweet'heart stealthily and makes him amazed;
Him, whose joy has become transparent;
Hari in the merry crowd of maidens;
With the sporting girls, he jokes in pageantry of joy.
One damsel, on the strand of the Yamunā,
In ecstasy of whirl of rupture,
Pulls him by his cloth,
Him who has retired into an airy grove;
Hari in the merry etc.
One, charming girl, he embraces, another he kisses ;
He brings a third one to his heart;
With a lovely smile he looks at yet another
And follows still an other attracting one;
Hari in the merry, etc. [1]"

Then the poet n a r r a t e s how in jealousy Rādhā leaves the scene and retires into a grove, and in the next prabandha, she complains to her confidante about her sweet'heart being unfaithful; but on the contrary, in another prabandha she gives expression to her ardent longing for him and to her wish that her lover may approach her and embrace her. It is followed by a n a r r a t i v e s t a n z a: tortured by love Kṛṣṇa leaves the cowherdesses and full of repentance searches for them. His bewaling

1. Translation according to the German rendering of R ü c k e r (I 14, 41, 44).

is contained in the next song. This is followed by recitative verses in which Kṛṣṇa addresses partly the god of love and partly Rādhā and gives expression to his longing for his beloved. This ends in a benedictory verse, in which Kṛṣṇa, the lover of Rādhā, is invoked for conferring fortune and happiness upon the audience. Narrative stanza: the friend of Rādhā comes and speaks to her love-lorn Kṛṣṇa. In the song that follows, she describes the agony of love-sick Rādhā resulting from her separation, and in two more songs she portraits her further misery caused on account of love. The conclusion is again a benedictory stanza. Narrative stanza: Kṛṣṇa wants the confidante to go to Rādhā and to bring her to him. It is followed by a song, in which the friend of Rādhā narrates how Kṛṣṇa has got emaciated on account of his longing for her and that he with an ardent yearning is expecting her in the grove. A narative strophe describes the place where the lover is awaiting. Then follows a song, in which the confidante, in warmly glowing words, breathing wild sensuousness, commands Rādhā to give up her anger and to hasten to embrace Kṛṣṇa. How musical sounds the refrain of this song: *dhīre samīre yamunātīre vasati vane vanamālī* in

patati patatre vicalitapatre śaṅkitabhavadupayānam ।
racayati śayanaṁ sacakitanayanaṁ paśyati tava panthānam ॥
dhīre samīre yamunātīre vasati vane vanamālī ।
mukharamadhīraṁ tyaja mañjīraṁ ripumiva kelisulolam ॥
cala sakhi kuñjaṁ satimirapuñjaṁ śīlaya nīlanicolam ॥
dhīre samīre.... ॥

Rückert translates into German the verse V, 10 of this poem that can be rendered into English as follows:—

"When a bird moves about and stirs among the
leaves, He thinks that thou hast come.
He prepares the bed with His eyes amazed : He is anxious
to meet thee.
In the sweet-smelling grove, on the bank of the
Yamunā, in the gentle breeze, the lotus-garlanded
(God) is awaiting.

Away with the anklet, that is sounding and is set in
motion and acts as a traitor in matter of love;
O friend, start for the bush, that is fully
enveloped in the dark, and put on a blue garment.
In the sweet-smelling etc."

The following recitation-verses are merely a continuation of the friend's speech contained in songs, etc.

This poem has often been designated as dramatic. Lassen has called it "a lyrical drama". L. v. Schroeder has referred to it as "a lyric-dramatic poem" and a "refined yātrā"[1]. That the poet himself called his poem a "kāvya", i.e. an epic poem is proved by its division into sargas or "cantos." On the other hand, he has undoubtedly interwoven in the frame of the kāvya songs composed on popular models, that cannot be conceived without music, song and dance. In one of the verses (IV, 9), in which the poet has mentioned his name, he says about himself that his song is to be staged in mind (*manasā naṭanīyam*). Hence it follows that the poet had no intention to write a dramatic poem, in no case a proper drama[2], but his task was to write a book in which popular dance-play with music and tunes served as a model for songs, that constitute the nucleus of the book[3].

1. ILC., p. 563 ff., 580ff. Nisikānta Chattopādhyāya, Indische Essays, Zürich 1883, p. 4 too calls Gītagovinda "a type of yātrā in Sanskrit". Cf. Lévi, 234 ff. and preface to Courtillier's transl., p. v ff. Pischel (HL 22) says: "It is further removed from the first beginnings of drama, because the poet has left no room for improvisation, even the transition-verses having been cast by him in a firm mould" and he has called the poem a "melodrama" (KG 209). For a manuscript with very precise directions in respect of the gesticulations (movement of the hand and the head etc.) see A. C. Burnell, A Classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS in the Palace at Tanjore, London 1880, p. 157 f. One Kṛṣṇanāṭaka, that is a "lyrical drama", that is said to be of the type of Gītagovinda, is played in Malabar even during these days, and that not by professional actors, but by men who have been especially trained for this purpose; see K. Rāma-varma Rāja, JRAS 1910, 638.

2. More than the yātrās, that nevertheless are dramatic works, that presuppose a stage and a dialogue, the Indrasabhā of Amānat, translated by Fr. Rosen (Leipzig 1892), brings to mind the Gītagovinda, even though this song-play is more dramatical.

3. Pischel, KG 209 says: "The poem, in which rhyme and alliteration play a great role, appears to go back to an original in Prākrit". This is hardly correct in the present form. The poet did not work on a particular Prākrit model, but his Sanskrit songs have been written in the form of songs in the popular language. [Cf. Keith, HSL, p. 197 f.; S. K. De, HSL, pp. 392 ff.; S. K. Chatterji, ODBL p. 24.]

In fact the songs of Jayadeva are sung even in temples and on days of religious festivals and they accompany dance as well'[1]. Since attempt has been made by every commentator, hardly correctly, to interpret many of its erotic verses as having a mystical meaning, love of human soul (Rādhā) for God (Kṛṣṇa), in any case it is true that the poem has a religious character and that in the opinion of the poet the whole eroticism of the poem is merely a part of the *bhakti*, the religious devotion to God Kṛṣṇa.

It is true that Jayadeva belongs to the greatest poetical genii of India. It is, however, astonishing that he was able to combine so much passion and sentiment of love, so much alliteration in language, that often resounds as pure music in our ears, with such an ornate and yet artificial a form. It is no wonder that in India the poem enjoys unusual popularity and has always found admirers even outside India. It is so difficult to bring into translations the brilliance of languge that they can reproduce its charms just partially. Even extracts from a defective English translation of the poet by W. Jones engendered feeling of wonder in Goethe. He deplores the fact that although "the incomparable Jones" had remained within the limits of decorum, the German translator Herr v. Dalberg has gone for away in his German translation and the great poet expresses his intention even to translate the poem[2].

The Bhakt-Mālā narrates that the Rājā of Nīlācala in Orissa too had written one Gītagovinda and he invited Brāhmaṇas to make the book known. But they did not like to approve of it. It was decided that both the books, that is of Jayadeva and of the king, should be brought into the temple of Jagannātha and to leave the decision to the god himself. Then the god put the book of Jayadeva about his neck like a neklace and threw

1. As late as in the time of W. Jones (As. Res. 3, 183) at Kendulī, the place of birth of Jayadeva, was celebrated a feast, in which the Gītagovinda was sung with a dance during the night. In an inscription of the year 1499 King Pratāparudradeva ordains that female dancers and female Vaiṣṇava singers should learn and sing only the songs of Gītagovinda. One verse from the Gītagovinda has been quoted in an inscription of the year 1292. Cf. M. Chakravarti JASB, N. S. 2, 1906, 166 ff., [S. K. De, HSL, p. 390].

2. Goethes Werke, Jubiläumsausgabe Vol. 37, p. 210 ff.; Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe, II, p. 303-309.

the book of king out of the temple. Although the god decided in favour of the work of Jayadeva, the succeeding generations have not, however, failed to imitate his poem again and again. In a large number of poems, their writers have not only glorified the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, but they have composed new poems describing the love between Rāma and Sītā and between Śiva and Pārvatī as well in a similar manner, in slavish imitation of the Gītagovinda[1].

At the first sight it may appear probable that in love-lyrics of Indians, in contrast to the love-ballads of other nations, the element of thought prevails over all other. The truth is that this is strong in love-songs of India for the taste of Westerners, that is already strongly prepossessed: the beautiful ladies bend down under the load of their breasts, their hips are like trunks of an elephant, the lovers remove with violence the garment of the loving women; often the theme is biting and scratching—but lovers and beloved forget these too on account of their longing and die for love. It is also true that like court ornate poetry, the Indian lyrics, for the taste of Westerners, are all the more important for their form, and really they are often nothing more than an ingenious play. But not seldom we come across also true and deep feelings and internal devotion likewise in erotic and religious lyrics. In India, in lyric poetry, as in the whole of Indian poetry, the deep natural feeling is genuine and unaffected[2].

Gnomic and Didactic Poetry

Closely connected with lyrics is gnomic poetry. In many works lyric stanzas and didactic passages are blended into a single whole in such a way that one may be in doubt in the

1. Cf. Aufrecht, Bodl. Cat. 1, 129 and ZDMG 41, 489 ff. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat., VII, p. 1443 ff., 1460 ff.; 1480; V. Henry, Les littératures de l'Inde, p. 293 f.; Bhandarkar, Report 1882-1883, p. 9. Such works are: Gītagaṅgādhara of Kalyāṇa (see Pischel, HL 21); Gītagaurīśa of Bhānudatta; Gītagirīśa [of Rāmabhaṭṭa]; Rāmgītagovinda, wrongly attributed to Jayadeva; Lalitamādhava of Rūpagosvāmin, Gītarāghava of Prabhākara: Gītadigambara of Vaṁśamaṇi (Haraprasād, Report I, 18).

2. "The deepest natural sentiment has in all times been the principal characteristic of the Indian mind", Th. Goldstücker (Allegemeine Betrachtungen über das indische Naturgefühl) in Alex. v. Humboldt, Kosmos, II, 115ff.

matter of grouping them. Perhaps Indians have not attained such perfect mastery in any sphere as in gnomic poetry. They have not more wonderfully succeeded in anything as in the art of giving brief and accurate expression to an idea in two lines. Most of the epigrams are written in the form of ślokas—and they describe accurately or often lay out a beautiful picture either from nature or with the help of a strikingly deep thought simile. Numerous narratives, aphorisms and statements in literature, however, also prove the existence of rich treasure of "nice saying" (*subhāṣita*), that has been stored up by Indians of all the ages[1]. Nowhere else do these epigrams occur more beautifully and with greater grandeur than in the Sāvitrī-peom in the Mahābhārata. As we have already seen above, we find abudance of aphorisms also at other places in the Mahābhārata, both in the epic proper and in the didactic sections in particular[2]. These epigrams are in no way always 'conventional moral lessons', but have reference partly to wordly wisdom (*artha, nīti*) and partly to duty (*dharma*)[3]. They are, very often, in fact, the sequel to extensive personal experience, and there is no sphere of human life that has not been touched by them. Even up to this day it is a necessary part of education to know suitable epigrammatic stanzas, that are fit to be quoted in appropriate places in course of conversation[4]. That it was so in earlier times too is proved by an aphorism quoted in anthologies[5]:

"Wrongly we call tongue a tongue,
That knows not a beautiful term;
It is a piece of flesh, stuck into the mouth,
For fear, lest a crow may detect it[5]."

1. Cf. e.g. Böhtlingk, Ind. Sprüche 2595, 3135, 4186, 4776, 7194: Manu 2, 239; Subhāṣitāvali 2349.

2. Cf. above I, 320 f., 323, 341, 359 ff., 376 f.; transl. p. 376 f., 380, 399, 416 f., 425 f.

3. The term "Ethical Poetry" in Macdonell, Hist. of Sanskrit Literature 377 is not correct. In the Mahābhārata (e.g. V, 33-37) too wordly wisdom and moral lessons have been taught without distinguishing between them.

4. "A man is not considered to be a learned person, probably rightly, unless be can quote at least a few of the poet's famous epigrams that throw light on the question forming the topic of conversation, in which he participates" says the Indian Krishna Śāstrī Bhatavadekar in his foreword to the collection of maxims published by him; see Pantschatantra, transl. by L. Fritze, p. XI f.

5. Transl. into German by Fritze, Indische Sprüche 387 (Böhtlingk, Ind. Sprüche 4776).

The Indian poets had a fancy for inserting aphoristic stanzas throughout. We find them in the epic, in the prose novel and even in the drama. They form a component part of the Buddhist and Jaina religious literature[1], as also of the religious and mundane narrative literature. The Śunaḥśepa-legend of the Aitareyabrāhmaṇa points to the existence of aphoristic literature even in the Vedic age. The scientific literature on law and politics (dharmaśāstra and nītiśāstra) is so full of poetical aphorisms that drawing a line of demarcation between gnomic poetry and scientific literature is often difficult. Numerous epigrams, that were current in literary circles and whose authors in usual course would have been forgotten, were brought together in collections, preferably in śatakas or "centuries" and many authors themselves wrote the whole collections of epigrams. The lines of demarcation between compilation and self-composed poems were often obliterated because of the fact that the latter, in case they became popular, were mutilated and added to by copyists in course of time.

One of the most popular aphoristic collections is the one that is attributed to C ā ṇ a k y a[2], the minister of the Maurya king Candragupta. Cāṇakya is the model of the wise and clever minister. The authorship of the famous manual of polity, the Kauṭilīya-Arthaśāstra, is attributed to one Kauṭilya "crookedness". In the same way as all laws are traced back to Manu, the mythical first king, who has been made the author of not only of manual of morals and law but also of a large number of legal and moral maxims that have even been in circulation, all the teachings on polity and wordly wisdom are traced back to Cāṇakya, famous in legends, who has at last been made the author of a great collection of proverbs, that perhaps originally consisted only of the principles of polity (rājanīti), but in course of time, has assumed in the hands of copyists more and more the character of a variegated mixed collection of sayings. There are not less than seven different recensions of this work that appears under different titles in the

1. See above II, 26, 49, 60, 64 f., 84, 99, 116, 312 f., 343 f., 349 f.; transl. 34, 65, 76, 82 f., 108, 124, 144, 466 f. 562 f., 573 f.

2. The name, rather the personality of Cāṇakya reminds us of Kaṇika, who appears in the Mahābhārata (I, 140) as a teacher of nītiśāstra and as a type of Macchiavelli.

manuscripts[1]. There is nothing to think about the minister Cāṇakya being the real author of these wise sayings. It is also not correct at the same time to find in them "popular poerty" and to equate them with adages[2], that circulate from mouth to mouth, without being considered to have belonged to a single author. The proverbs originated rather in literary circles and partly they go back to works in literature and partly they were composed by the authors, whose names are forgotten. It is, however, assumed that we are not able to attribute a collection of this type to any definite period.

The form in which the collection has come down to us shows all the characteristic traits of Indian aphoristic poetry in general, including those in respect of variety of its contents. Although in its title there usually occurs the word rājanīti ("king's politics"), comparatively it contains few maxims on the art of administration. On the other hand, we find many common rules of conduct, that are as "Macchiavellistical" as the rules of administrative polity, in addition to numerous contribution. on the knowledge of human nature and life, on wealth and

1. Rājanītiśāstra, Cāṇakyarājanīti, Rājanītisamuccaya, Cāṇakyanīti Cāṇakyanītidarpaṇa, Vṛddhacāṇakya, Laghucāṇakya, Cāṇakyanītisāra. Cf. O Kressler, Stimmen indischer Lebensklugheit, where he investigates into the collection of aphoristic stanzas that are attributed to Cāṇakya and has translated them into German from one of the recensions. Leipzig, 1907 (Indica, edited by E. Leumann, Heft 4). Other editions: Haeberlin 312 ff.; J. Klatt, De trecentis Cāṇakyae poetae Indici sententiis. Diss. Halis Saxonum, Berol. 1873; Weber, Indische Streifen I 253 ff. und Monatsberichte der k. Akademie Berlin 1864, 400 ff. On the numerous Indian editions see Kressler, ibid, p. 38 ff. Cāṇakyasārasaṁgraha, a work, widely known among the Buddhists of Nepal, too is reported to contain 830 aphorisms (see Rājendralāla Mitra, Sanskrit Buddhist Lit. of Nepal, Calcutta, 1882, p. 282 f.) One Cāṇakyanītiśāstra is found also in the Tibetan Tanjūr; see G. Huth, SBA 1895, p. 275. The wisdom aphorisms of Sānāq (i. e. Cāṇakya) found in the Arabic work Sirāj al-Mulūk by at-Torṭūsī (12th century) are also probably based on Cāṇakyanītisāra; see Th. Zachariae in WZKM 28, 1914, 182 ff. The aphorisms have been repeatedly translated : so thus into Greek by D. Galanos, [See J van Manen, Foreward to the 2nd edition of Cāṇakyarājanītiśāstram, ed. by Iśvara Chandra Śāstrī, Calcutta Or Ser., 1921, p. III], into English by Muir, Metrical Translations from Sanskrit writers; into German by Böhtlingk in the "Indischen Sprüchen." Cf. also G. M. Bolling, The Recension of Cāṇakya used by Galanos for his Ἐκ διαφορῶν ποιητῶν JAOS 1921 p. 49 ff. Rightly remarks Bolling that the last word has not yet been said with Kressler's book on the "Original Cāṇakya", since much of the materials for establishment of the text has not yet been used. [Another English transl. is by K. Raghunāthaji, Bombay, 1890].

2. As has been done by Kressler, ibid, p. 27.

poverty, on fate and human activity, on women and lastly on all sorts of padagogical, religious and ethical teachings. Only in a few cases in its contents we find groups of connected stanzas after so variegated passages jumbled up together. So in the verses VI, 15-22, where twenty things are enumerated that man should learn from animals, one from the loin, one from the heron, four from the cock, five from the crow, six from the dog and three from the donkey, one in the wholly seemingly compact "breviary of life". Likewise in the group of verses XI, II-17, different types of Brāhmaṇas are enumerated. More often we find pairs of homogeneous verses. But in general each verse is a unified whole.

Popular are the maxims in which different but a little similar things—many times not without humour—are named just for the sake of principle of enumeration, as we have found in the Aṅguttaranikāya and in the Thāṇaṁga. This sort of enumeration certainly became popular before it got extended to all over the work with such pedantry in the Buddhist and Jaina literatures. For example I, 9 f.:—"Not for a single day should a man stay at the place where five are not to be found: a rich man, a scholar, a king, a river and a physician. And man should not turn his step towards the place, where the five are not met with: means of livelihood, security, modesty, politeness, and generosity,". Or IV, II: "One devotes himself to penance all alone, studies in the company of two, sings in the company of three, travels in the company of four, cultivates the field in the company of five and goes to the field of battle in the company of many". Or VII, 4: "One should show oneself satisfied in respect of three: in respect of his wife, in respect of his meal, in respect of wealth; in respect of three he should not feel satisfied :— in respect of study, penance and gifts". XVII, 19: "A king, a courtesan, Yama (the god of death), fire, a robber, a child, a beggar and as the eighth a village magistrate—all these do not perceive the grief of their neighbours". Often the point of the saying appears in the form of a superlative at the end of enumeration; So IV, 13: "vacant is the house of the childless man, vacant is the region in which there

dwells no kinsman, vacant is the heart of the fool; and poverty is vacuum itself". Popular are the enumerations that are joined to catch-words or contain some sort of definition. For example IV, 14: "Poison is the book that has not been studied thoroughly, poison is the food that is not digested, poison is the knowledge to the poor and poison is a young girl for an old man"[1].

Pictures and similes in epigrammatic poetry are always popular, and particularly numerous are the sayings in which the subjects spoken about are illustrated with the help of examples from nature. E.g. III, 14 f.; "Through a single nice tree, that is in blossom and smells well, the entire forest gets permeated with odour; likewise a whole family with a single noble son becomes 'fragrant', i. e. attains honour. With a single dry tree, that is set on fire, the entire forest gets into flame; likewise with a single bad son it gets burnt" i.e. comes to ruin"; V, 18: "With truth is sustained the earth, with truth glows the sun, with truth blows the wind : all rest on truth" XII; 7: "In the company of the noble the bad become noble, but the noble do not become bad in the company of the bad: the sweet smell that the flower emits makes the earthen vessel fragrant, but the flowers do not take the smell of the pot"[2].

If Cāṇakya is just a name, that has been used as the supporting pillar for gnomic poetry, Bhartṛhari, whose three śatakas or centuries—Śṛṅgāraśataka, Nītiśataka, and Vairāgyaśataka[3], are included among the most famous works of Indian poetry, is a real poetic personality. This is shown particularly by the first of the three collections, the Śṛṅgāraśataka, "The Hundred on Love".

1. Wholly of the same type are the aphorisms of Bharata, that A. Schiefner (Mahākātjājana und König Tschaṇḍa—Pradjota, Mémoires, de l'Academie de St. Pétersbourg, Part XXII, No. 7, 1875, p. 54 ff.) has translated from Tibetan.

2. All citations and translations are from the German renderings from Vṛddhacāṇakya of Kressler.

3. Editions : Bhartriharis sententiae. . .ed., latine vertit et commentariis instruxit, P. a Bohlen, Berolini, 1883, Haeberlin, 143 ff. The Nītiśataka and Vairāgyaśataka of Bh., with Extracts from two Sanskrit commentaries, ed. by K. T. Telang, BSS No. 11, 1885. Subhāṣita-Triśatī of Bh. with the Commentary of Rāmacandra Budhendra, ed. P. Parab. Bombay 1902 NSP. Edition with Ṭīkā and Bhāṣāṭīkā of Gaṅgāviṣṇugupta and Khemarājāgupta, Bombay 1885.

This, at the same time, is also a characteristic collection of erotic stanzas, like the Amaruśataka. Whilst the strophes of the Amaruśataka present, to us pictures from amorous life the verses of the Śṛṅgāraśataka are expressive of general ideas about love and women. The Śataka begins with verses in which the pleasure of love and beauty of women, on one hand, and the force of love and its joys, particularly the change of seasons, on the other, are described. Then follow the verses in which the joy of love has been compared with the peace of mind, attained through penance and wisdom; and in the last quarter of the śataka the poet comes to realise more and more that wife is merely a sweet poison, just a snake lying on the way, and that love is merely an allurement that attracts one to wordly pleasures; whlist real happiness can be found only in renunciation of the world and in God (Śiva, Brahman). Now it is possible that these stanzas have been so arranged by an able compiler that they bring before us a picture of the oscillation of the Indian mind between sensuousness and renunciation of the world. It is possible that the same compiler, whilst he had added the Nītiśataka, "The Hundred of Wordly Wisdom" and the Vairāgyaśataka, "The Hundred of Renunciation of the World" to the Śṛṅgārśataka, he pursued the objective in the three "centuries" of selected maxims on the path of the wise, from sexual pleasure to virue and performance of duty and wished to describe as the highest goal, the renunciation of the world.

But against this commonly accepted hypothesis that Bhartṛhari's śatakas are merely anthologies[1] stand two strong facts. Firstly the unanimous and unbroken tradition of India. It is not suggested that a similar tradition has made Vyāsa the poet of the Mahābhārata and Cāṇakya the writer of the collection of sayings that are associated with his name. Vyāsa is an old sage, whom the people voluntarily made the author of old venerable texts, that were desired to be accorded

1. So Colebrooke, Misc. Essays, II, 174; v. Bohlen. Praefatio, p. viii of his edition: Aufrecht, Leipzig No. 417 (Sprüche von verschiedenen Dichtern, Welche in früher Zeit in drei sogenannten Zenturien Zusammengetsellt und einem Dichter Bhartṛhari Zugeteilt wurden) and CC., p. 397; Pathak, JBRAS 18, 348 ("Collection of elegant extracts for many of which Bh. was indebted to previous writers) and particularly Hertel, WZKM 16, 202 ff.; Tantrākhyāyika-Übersetzung I.S. 4, and LZB. 1907, 3 Aug.

a special religious status. Cāṇakya is a very famous chancellor who on account of his wisdom in administration has been made the carrier of all epigrams concerning statesmanship and afterwards also of those concerning wordly wisdom. But the name of Bhartṛhari is famous just as a writer of gnomic stanzas and as that of a grammarian : then the tales, that have got tagged to his name are of very late origin and perhaps originated in the first place on the basis of the epigrammatic stanzas that pass under his name. In the second place, not only the three śatakas, but rather the Śṛṅgāraśataka alone exhibits completely explicit physiognomy of the poet. The verses of the Śṛṅgāraśataka and also a majority of verses of both the other śatakas bear such definite individual traits, that J. J. Meyer could call Bhartṛhari "one right charactersistic brain of old India" that represents the "typical Hindu" in his wavering between glowing sensuality and asceticism and that H. Oldenberg[2], notwithstanding the fact that he doubts the authorship of Bhartṛhari and leaves the question "how far to him, an individual, does the definite personality correspond", openly calls him an Indian living in a forest". What is so especially a characteristic for Bhartṛhari, that is attainment of the renunciation of the world from pleasures of lust, has never been said so clearly as in the verse in which he says :

yadāsīdajñānaṁ smaratimirasaṁcārajanitaṁ
tadā sarvaṁ nārīmayamidamaśeṣaṁ jagadabhūt ।
idānīmasmākaṁ paṭutaravivekāñjanadṛśāṁ
samībhūtā dṛṣṭistribhuvanamapi brahma manute ॥

"When in the darkness of love,
Ignorant, I wandered about, I saw nothing,
Nothing in the wide world, but only women;
But just when I was cured of the blindness,
Through knowledge, the ointment for the eye,
Forthwith appeared all calmly over my eye,
And I saw in the world only one: Brahma[3] !"

When, in the verse, in which he remarks that love and

1. Daśakumāracarita—Translation (German), p. 1
S.K. De, Treatment of Love in Sanskrit Literature, p. 33 ff.]

2. LAI p. 226.

3. Śṛṅgāraś. 98, translated into German by L. V. Schroe Mangobluten, p. 24.

wisdom are the extremities of life, but represent the two p a t h s to happiness, as he says:

saṁsāresminnasāre pariṇatitarale dve gatī paṇḍitānāṁ
tattvajñānāmṛtāmbhaḥplavalalitadhiyāṁ yātu kālaḥ kadācit ।
no cenmugdhāṅganānāṁ stanajaghanābhogasaṁsargiṇīnāṁ
sthūlopasthasthalīṣu sthagitakaratalasparśalolodytānām ॥

"In this world, full of deceipt, with vaccilating consequences,
There are two paths in which a mortal being delights:
He may drink in wisdom from religious writings either,
Or he may sink into the bosoms of young maidens."

Or rather more appropriately:—

kimiha bahubhiruktairyuktiśūnyaiḥ pralāpair
dvayamiha puruṣāṇāṁ sarvadā sevanīyam ।
abhinavamadalīlālālasaṁ sundarīṇāṁ
stanabharaparikhinnaṁ yauvanaṁ vā vanaṁ vā ॥

"Why make words unnecessarily;
You can attain pleasure in two ways:
Either rejoice in the company of young damsels,
Or enjoy peace and tranquility by retiring into a forest[1]."

Thence it seems likely that there existed on old work in the śatakas of Bhartṛhari, and possibly the Śṛṅgāraśataka has, at least apparently, retained the original order of stanzas, whilst the Vairāgyaśataka and more particularly the Nītiśataka, on account of inaccuracy and arbitrary action of the copyists, have, in fact, become more or less anthologies, of which only a small portion contains the genuine verses of Bhartṛhari.

As yet it has not been possible to arrive at a decision with regard to the problem of the poet Bhartṛhari being identical with the grammarian Bhartṛhari, the author of a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali and of the Vākyapadīya, a treatise on the philosophy of language. About this scholar Bhartṛhari the Chinese pilgrim I - t s i n g says that he was a faithful follower of Buddhism and became famous in the whole of India and died "forty years ago". Since I-tsing wrote his report in 691 A.D., Bhartṛhari must have died in about 651 A.D[2]. I-tsing, however,

1. Śṛṅgāraśataka 19, 53, translated into German by P. V. B o h l e n.
2. I-tsing, A Record of Buddhist Religion, transl. by J. T a k a k u s u, p. 178 ff.

says nothing as to whether this grammarian was also the writer of the aphoristical stanzas, but he narrates a noteworthy story: He became a monk seven times in succession and returned to hearth each time. Once when he had already overcome his sensuous desires and had retired into a cloister he had to ask a young man to keep a vehicle ready for him outside the cloister and then he felt that even then he was not fit to become a monk. I-tsing has quoted also a verse in which Bhartṛhari rebukes himself on account of his inability to withstand the glamour of the world. On the basis of this report Max M ü l l e r[1] has presumed that the grammarian Bhartṛhari might have been also the poet of our śatakas. The fact is that the story about our poet narrated by I-tsing fits him very well. But on the other hand, it is remarkable that the Chinese pilgrim, who speaks so much about this man, has not directly mentioned the work on account of which his name has become famous in the whole of India, even though the grammatical and philosophical works mentioned by him have become almost extinct. Moreover, Bhartṛhari in the śatakas is not a Buddhist, but a declared devotee of Śiva in the Vedāntist sense[2]. Now it is possible that Bhartṛhari was a Śaiva Brāhmaṇa, who was at first a court-poet[3] and householder, became an adherent of Śaiva Vedānta, and lastly embraced Buddhism[4]. In this case we must assume that I-tsing did not either mention the śatakas or would not like to say anything about them, because they were written by the poet before he had embraced Buddhism. But this sort of hypothesis does not appear very probable after we take into consideration the very story told by I-tsing. In case it cannot be admitted that in the very indefinite statement of I-tsing on the works of Bhartṛhari there is also an allusion to the śatakas[5], all that

1. Indien in seiner weltgeschichtlichen Bedeutung, p. 302 ff.; [India, what can it teach us? London 1883, p. 337. On the identity of the grammarian Bhartṛhari, see B a r n e t t, JRAS, 1923, p. 422].

2. Cf. T e l a n g, Introduction to his edition, pp. IX f., XXIII f. and E. La T e r z a in OC XII, Rome 1899, I, 201 ff.

3 The numerous stanzas in the Vairāgyaśataka in which he has spoken about the disgust and humiliations of servants of princes point to his once having been a court-poet.

4. According to K. B. P a t h a k a, JBRAS, 18, 1893, 341 ff., it is probable that Bhartṛhari, the grammarian might have been a Buddhist.

5. When for example he says that the Bhartṛhariśāstra does not treat grammar only but also the principles of human life, and that in the book Peina, he describes the excellences of human principles.

remains is to admit that I-tsing had merely heard about the works of the grammarian Bhartṛhari[1] and that the stories that were told him about Bhartṛhari related to a poet of this very name, who was the author of the śatakas. In that case this poet must have lived considerably before 650 A.D.[2].

The legends and stories that make Bhartṛhari a brother of the famous legendary king Vikramāditya are of no value for a biography of the poet. Merutuṅga, in his great collection of literary anecdotes[3], narrates one such tale, and another one, the story of the wandering fruit is found in the commentary on the Nītiśataka (verse 2)[4] where it serves to explain the verse:

yāṁ cintayāmi satataṁ mayi sā viraktā
sāpyanyamicchati sa janonyasaktaḥ ।
asmatkṛte ca parituṣyati kācidanyā
dhiktāṁca taṁca madanaṁca imāṁ ca māṁ ca ॥

"She, about whom I think always: she likes me not;
She loves another man, who loves an other girl;
And yet there is another woman, who seeks my love:
Fie on her, on him; rebuke me and him and the god of love."

Whilst these tales have clearly been fabricated to explain a single stanza or have been dragged in for this purpose, there are other tales that make Bhartṛhari a disciple of Gorakṣanātha, a Śaiva saint of th 15th century[5]. It still remains to be decided whether this is just a bold anachronism or if it has been said about a different Bhartṛhari.

Bhartṛhari probably is the first Indian poet, to have become famous in Europe. The Dutch Calvinist missionary Abraham Roger got the moral teachings of Bhartṛhari

1. It cannot be assumed that I-tsing had himself known this work. Besides his remarks are so very indefinite. See Bühler in Takakusu, ibid p. 225.

2. We cannot draw any conclusion, with regard to chronology, from the verses that Bhartṛhari has in common with other works (Tantrākhyāyika, Kālidāsa's Śakuntalā, Viśākhadatta's Mudrārākṣasa), since we have no means to know if the relevant verses originally belonged to Bhartṛhari or not.

3. Prabandhacintāmaṇi, transl. by C. H. Tawney, p. 198.

4. Also in the introduction to Siṁhāsanadvātriṁśikā and also in the Hindī rendering of the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā; see Weber, Ind. Stud. 15, 210, 212 ff., 270 ff. and H. Oesterley, Baitāl Pachisī', p. 13 ff. 176.

5. One of these tales has been dramatized in the Bhartṛharinirveda, see Gray, JAOS 25, 1904, 197 ff. A. V. W. Jackson in Ujjain had heard another, see JAOS 23, 1902, 313 f.

explained to him by a Brāhmaṇa Padmanābha and included them in his translation of this book "De open Deure tot het verborgen Heydendom", (The Open Door to Heathendom) published at Leiden in 1651[1]. From this book Herder knew about the epigrammatic stanzas, from which he translated some selected ones into German[2]. Since then more stanzas of Bhartṛhari have repeatedly been translated[3]. A few probes will go to show that the fame of Bhartṛhari is well justified :—

nūnaṁ hi te kavivarā viparītabodhā
ye nityamāhurabalā iti kāminīnām ।
yābhirvilokataratārakadṛṣṭipātaiḥ
śakrādayopi vijitā abalā kathaṁ tāḥ ॥

"Certainly such poets are a bit off,
As do always sing of the debility of woman;
With whose eye-glance even Indra and others get fettered,
How can she be called weak."

tāvadeva kṛtīnāṁ hṛdi sphuratyeṣa nirmalavivekadīpaḥ ।
yāvadeva na kuraṅgacakṣusāṁ tāḍyate capalalocanāñcalaiḥ ॥

"The torch of wisdom burns bright and clear
Only so long as beautiful eyes wink:
Thereafter it extinguishes quickly."

kadarthitasyāpi hi dhairyavṛtter-
na śakyate dhairyaguṇaḥ pramārṣṭum ।

1. A. Roger's "Offne Tür zu dem verbborgenen Heydenthum, translated from Dutch into German, Nürnberg 1663, p. 459-536; "Dess Heydnischen Barthrouherri hundert Sprüche von dem Weg Zum Himmel; and hundert Sprüche von don vernünftigen Wandel unter den Menschen". That is, therefore, merely a translation of the Vairāgyaśataka and the Nītiśataka. The Brāhmaṇa it appears did not like to translate to him the "love-stanzas" on one or the other ground.

2. At first in 1792 in the "Gedanken einiger Brahmanen" (Herders sämtl. Werke 1828, Zur Litteratur und Kunst, Bd. 9, 141 ff.), also in the "Vermischten Stücken aus verschiedenen morgenländischen Dichtern",ibid p. 157 ff., some also in J. G. v. Herders, "Blumenlese aus morgenländischen Dichtern," Berlin 1818.

3. A complete German metrical transation by P. von Bohlen, Hamburg 1835. selected Sayings translated by Rückert (Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes II, Göttingen 1837, p. 14 ff.; Rückert—Nachlese, I, 341 ff.), Hoefer. (Indische Gedichte, I, 141 ff.; II, 168 ff.), L. V. Schroeder (Mangoblüten 21 ff.; cf. Reden und Aufsätze, p. 163 ff.), E. Meier, Klassische Dichtungen der Inder, III, 75 ff.; included entirely in Böhtlingk, Indische Sprüche too. [English trans. by C. H. Tawney, "Two Centuries of Bhartṛhari, Calcutta 1877; and Ind. Ant. 4, 1875 and 5, 1876); by B. Hale Wortham, The Śatakas of Bhartṛhari (Trübner Or. Series); into Greek by D. Galanos, Athens 1845, into French by Regnaud, 1875.]

adhomukhasyāpi kṛtasya vahner-
nādhaḥ śikhā yāti kadācideva ||

"As the flame of light, even when turned down, goes up,
So do the noble, even afflicted by fortune, aspire up."

chinnopi rohati taruḥ kṣīṇopyupacīyate candraḥ |
iti vimṛśantaḥ santaḥ na viplutā loke ||

"Whether in trouble or in sorrow,
Steady remain the noble :
The moon, reduced to half, becomes full again;
The roots of a tree, even after its fall, may push up again."

śakyo vārituṁ jalena hutabhukchatreṇa sūryātapo
nāgendro niśitāṅkuśena samado daṇḍena gogardabhau |
vyādhirbheṣajasaṁgrahaiśca vividhairmantraprayogairviṣaṁ
sarvasyauṣadhamasti śāstravihitaṁ mūrkhasya nāstyauṣadham ||

"Fire can be restrained with water,
With an umbrella, the heat of the sun,
With a stick, the cow and the ass;
An elephant is controlled with a sharp goad;
Fever is checked with medicine,
And snake-bite with incantations :
Thus everything has its remedy,
But wickedness alone has none."

mahī ramyā śayyā vipulamupadhānaṁ bhujalatā
vitānaṁ cākāśaṁ vyajanamanukūloyamanilaḥ |
sphuraddīpaścandro virativanitāsaṅgamuditaḥ
sukhaṁ śāntaḥ śete muniratanubhūtirnṛpa iva ||

"The earth as the bed,
The arm as the pillow,
The sky , as the canopy,
The zephir, the favourable breeze,
Renunciation, the wife,
The moon, the blazing lamp;
A hermit sleeps in comfort,
Like a king possessing great wealth."

mātarmedini tāta māruta sakhe tejaḥ subandho jala
bhrātarvyoma nibaddha eṣa bhavatāmeṣa praṇāmāñjaliḥ |
yuṣmatsaṅgavaśopajātasukṛtodrekasphurannirmalo
jñānāpāstasamastamohamahimā līye pare brahmaṇi ||

"Earth, thou art my mother, the atmosphere, the father,
And thou fire, my friend, the water, my relation,
And my brother, the ether, I address you with folded hands,
The merit that I attained in your company,
When I was living below on earth;
With the brilliant knowledge,
That I gained, as a consequence thereof,
Now I go to the other world, abandoning you all,
Love brother and friend, love well father and mother[1]."

Bhartṛhari has had his imitators till the most recent times. Inferior epigones have sought to surpass his skill in respect of more artificial metres and kāvya-style, but they have never attained the height of his thought, but have moved within the orbit of his model[2].

Similar to the Nītiśataka of Bhartṛhari is the Bhallaṭaśataka[3] of the Kashmirian poet Bhallaṭa, who lived under King Śaṅkaravarman (883-902)[4]. The stanzas are composed in different metres. As an example an allegorical stanza is quoted below with translation:

je jātyā laghavaḥ sadaiva gaṇanāṃ yātā na ye kutracit
padbhyāmeva vimarditāḥ pratidinaṁ bhūmau nilīnāściram ।
utkṣiptāścapalāśayena marutā paśyāntarikṣe sakhe
tuṅgānāmuparisthitiṁ kṣitibhṛtāṁ kurvantyamī pāṁsavaḥ ॥

"The dust, light by nature, is deemed nought; day by day it is trampled beneath our feet and trodden into the ground;

1. Śṛṅgāraś. 10, 55; Nītiśa. 75, 84, Supplement 1; Vairāgyaś. 89, 96, according to the German transl. of P. v. Bohlen.

2. Rasiapaāsaṇa is an old Prākrit work of the type of Bhartṛhariśatakas. It consists of 400 gāthās composed by the Buddhist poet Vairocana. They (according to some probes that have been given by S. P. V. Raṅganathasvami Aryavaraguru, JASB, N.S., 6, 1910, 167 ff.) contain original ideas.

3. Published in Km. Part IV, p. 140 ff.

4. According to Rājataraṅgiṇī, 5, 204, where about this king it has been said that on account of his hatred for science he shunned important people. It was on account of this that a poet like Bhallaṭa lived in poverty. Verses written by him have been quoted under Aucityālaṅkāra in the Kāvyaprakāśa and in anthologies, see Peterson, JBRAS, 16, 167 ff. and Subh. 75 ff.; Aufrecht, ZDMG, 41, 488. The fact that a verse written by Ānandavardhana is found in our Bhallaṭaśataka shows that in this collection too stanzas written by other poets occur; see Jacobi ZDMG, 56, 1902, 405.

but see, dear friend, the fickle wind has tossed it high, and it settles now on the summit of the lofty mountains.[1]"

An imitation of Bhartṛhari's Vairāgyaśataka is the Śāntiśataka, "The Hundred of Peace of Soul[2]" of Śilhaṇa[3], who also came from Kashmir, but carried his literary activities in Bengal. Some of his verses are found also in Bhartṛhari and one of his stanzas is found also in the Nāgānanda of Harṣadeva. A great majority of the verses are, however, such as are found in anthologies other then the Śāntiśataka. Since Silhaṇa himself says that he "wrote" (*vidadhe*) the work, in the opinion of W., he is to be considered as the author and not as a compiler of the aphoristic stanzas, in case he had no intention to cite accurately. The Śāntiśataka is a piece of pure religious poetry in which the hollowness of life and the grandeur of renunciation of the world and of the life of ascetics have been described in a considerably monotonous manner. Many of the stanzas of Bhartṛhari have not been borrowed verbatim, but they have been modified. Some of the alterations have been made on account of Bhartṛhari's considering Śiva as the Highest God and Silhaṇa's view being that Viṣṇu is the Supreme God. As in all other works of this type, the manuscripts differ from one another very strongly, so that it cannot be said with certainty as to which of the verses belong to the original collection and which have been interpolated[4].

Under the name of Nāgarāja, one of the kings of

[1. Keith, HSL, p. 232.]

2. Edited with introduction, critical apparatus, German translation and notes by K. Schönfeld, Leipzig 1910. Cf. A. B. Keith, JRAS 1911, 257 ff. Also in Haeberlin 410 ff.

3. The name is written differently. Pischel presumes that the author of the poem is Bilhaṇa, since this name is often written as Silhaṇa or as Cilhaṇa, and a verse of Bilhaṇa occurs in many MSS of the Śāntiśataka.

4. One of the imitators of Bhartṛhari is Dhanadarāja, who wrote three śatakas in the year 1434 A.D. (published in Km., Part XIII, 1903, 33ff.). Janārdanabhaṭṭa wrote one Śṛṅgāraśataka and one Vairāgyaśataka (published in Km., Part XI, 1895, 133 ff., and Part XIII, 131 ff. Appaya Dīkṣita wrote one Vairāgyaśataka (edited in Km. Part I, 91 ff.). There is one Śṛṅgāratilaka written in ornate metres by one Narahari. It has been published in Km. Part XII, 1897, 37 ff. The name Narahari occurs so often as an author that it is not possible to determine his time. In 1220 A.D. one Narahari wrote a commentary on the Kāvyaprakāśa, see Peterson, Rep. IV, p. LXIX.

the Ṭāka-dynasty, is found one Bhāvaśataka[1], a kind of collection of riddles. In each verse it is said about some person that he would do this or that in certain situation; sometimes the reader is expected to conjecture why he did this or that; sometimes it is told at the end of the verse. Of indefinite age is the Upadeśaśataka[2] of Gumāni. In it common moral lessons are taught with the help of allusions to well-known myths and fables. Anyoktimuktālatā is another śataka, consisting of 108 ornate allegorical stanzas, of Śambhu, who lived in the court of King Harṣadeva (1089-1101 A.D.) of Kashmir[3].

Kusumadeva, a poet otherwise unknown, is the author of Dṛṣṭāntaśataka (or Dṛṣṭāntakalikā[5]; a collection of hundred proverbs, in which the wisdom-lesson, taught in the first line, has been illustrated with an example (dṛṣṭānta) in the second line, e.g. verse 10:

uttamaḥ kleśavikṣobhaṁ kṣamaḥ soḍhuṁ na hītaraḥ I
maṇireva mahāśāṇagharṣaṇaṁ na tu mṛtkaṇaḥ II

"Only the noble can bear the stroke of pain : jewel alone resists the pressure of grindstone, not the lime."

Smaller collections of proverbs—whether compilations

1. Edited in Km., Part IV, 37 ff. Cf. Bhandarkar, Report 1882-83, p. 9 f. 198; Peterson, 3 Reports p., 21 f., 338 f. There is one Śṛṅgāraśataka also by Nāgarāja. His time is not definite. According to R. Schmidt, Das alte und moderne Indien, Bonn and Leipzig 1919, p. 184 Nāgarāja was merely the patron of the poet Bhāva, and not the author of the Śatakas.

2. Edited in Km., Part II, 1886, 21 f.

3. Edited in Km., Part II, 61 ff. Śambhu's poem Rājendrakarṇapūra (edited in Km. I, 22 ff.) is written for glorification of King Harṣadeva. A son of Śambhu has been mentioned by Maṅkha (Śrīkaṇṭhacarita 25, 97) among his contemporaries.

4. The Anyoktiśataka of Bhaṭṭa Vīreśvara, edited in Km., V, 89 ff., the Anyāpadeśa śataka of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita, edited in Km. VI, 1890, 143 ff. and another Śataka bearing the same title of Madhusūdana of Mithilā, edited in Km., Part IX, 1893, 64 ff. Subhāṣitanīvī (edited in Km. Part VIII, 1891, 151 ff.) of the Vedānta scholar Veṅkaṭanātha is a collection of subhāṣitas in twelve sections and twelve stanzas. The author is often referred to simply as Vedāntadeśika and probably lived between 1268 and 1376 A.D. : see Krishnamacharya, 48 f., 123 f. A collection of 94 stanzas is the Lokoktimuktāvalī of Dakṣiṇāmūrti, published in Km., Part XI, 1895, 65 ff.

5. Haeberlin 217 ff. In Vallabhadeva's Subhāṣitāvali, 287-307, have been quoted 21 stanzas from this collection (but not in the same sequence as it is in our text). Kusumadeva must, therefore, have been anterior to Vallabhadeva.

or independent, poems, a thing that cannot be confirmed, are the Nītisāra, ascribed to Ghaṭakarpara, the Nītipradīpa of Vetālabhaṭṭa and the Nītiratna, ascribed to Vararuci[1]. Vararuci is best known as the author of a Prākrit grammar, but in anthologies stanzas written by him too are found, and Rājaśekhara mentions him in the list of his predecessors[1]. The following verses attributed to Vararuci in the Nītiratna are worthy of a good poet :—

itaratāpaśatāni yatheccha̍yā
vitara tāni sahe caturānana ।
arasikeṣu rasasya nivedanaṁ
śirasi mā likha mā likha mā likha ॥

"O Brahman, do avenge so much as you will,
My all such actions as are wicked ;
Yet write not this much, write not
The pass-word of fate, I implore you,
That those who have no taste,
May become poet, on their forehead."

saṁsāraviṣavṛkṣasya dve phale amṛtopame ।
kāvyāmṛtarasāsvāda ālāpaḥ sajjanaiḥ saha ॥

"On the poison-tree of life,
There grow two nectar-like fruits ;
Taste of nectar of poetry
And of talk with noble men."

kākasya cañcuryadi hemayuktā
māṇikyayuktau caraṇau ca tasya ।
ekaikapakṣe gajarājamuktā
tathāpi kāko na ca rājahaṁsaḥ ॥

"Even if the beak of a crow be plated with gold
And its feet decorated with rubies,
And its wings have pearls hanging from them,
It can still never become a flamingo."

Jagannātha's Bhāminīvilāsa[3] is partly

1. Text in the Haeberlin 502 ff., 526 ff., translated into German Böhtlingk, Indische Sprüche.

2. He ascribes to him a poem Kaṇṭhābharaṇa "necklace" : see Peterson, JBRAS 17,59.

3. The title means: "The Sport of a Beautiful Woman" or "The Sport of Bhāminī", in case *bhāminī* is to be taken as a proper noun. The text with French translation published by A. Bergaigne, Paris 1872 (Bibl. des hautes études I, 9); edited with a Sanskrit gloss by Lakshman Rama-

lyric and partly gnomic. We have seen above that this author was a scholar of theory of poetics and likewise a lyrist[1]. Like the Śatakas of Bhartṛhari, Bhāminī-Vilāsa too contains stanzas of which the theme oscillates between morality, erotics and renunciation of the world, and it is their common feature that the text of both of them is uncertain and the number of stanzas differs in different manuscripts. The first part, of which the number of stanzas varies between 100 and 130, contains moral lessons, of which many are allegorical[2]. The second part, of which the number of stanzas varies between 101 and 184 as in the manuscripts, contains erotic verses. The third part, consisting of only 18 to 19 strophes, is an elegy on the death of a beloved wife. And the fourth (31 to 46 stanzas) contains verses on happiness of the soul, renunciation of the world and entry into the soul of the universe identified with Kṛṣṇa. Some probese may represent the nature of poetry of Jagannātha. :

> *nairguṇyameva sādhiyo dhigastu guṇagauravān* |
> *śākhinonye virājante khaṇḍayante candanadrumāḥ* ||
> "Better it is to be without virtue;
> Fie on the person who is possessed of merits;
> Other trees remain flourishing,
> While the sandal-trees are cut by man". (I, 86)
> *hariṇīprekṣaṇā yatra gṛhiṇī na vilokyate* |
> *sevitaṁ sarvasaṃpadbhirapi tadbhavanaṁ vanam* ||
> A house may be full with all the objects of enjoyment; but in case the housewife, with glances life those of a deer, is not visible there, it is not different from a forest". (II, 154)

chandra Vaidya, Bombay 1887. (In the introduction Vaidya gives a list of the work of Jagannātha.) Trente stances du Bhāminī-Vilāsa accompagnées de fragments du commentaire inédit de Maṇirāma, publ. et trad. par. V. Henry, Paris 1885. D. Galanos has translated into Greek 98 stanzas of the first book in his 'Ιγδικῶν Μεταφρὰσεων Πρόοδρομος (Athens 1845). P. v. Bohlen has published the third book and translated it into German in the supplement to his edition of the Ṛtusaṁhāra, Lipsiae 1840. The same book has been translated into German by A. Hoefer, Ind. Gedichte II, 141ff. [Editions also by Shivararna Mahadeva Paranjape, Poona, 1895, with introduction, English translation and notes; by B. G. Bal, Bombay 1895, with Sanskrit gloss and English translation; edited critically with his own commentary by Har Dutt Sharma, Poona 1935.]

1. See above, p. 30, 141.

2. Hence called also Anyoktivilāsa.

sarvepi tasmin vismṛtipatham viṣayāḥ prayātā
vidyāpi khedakalitā vimukhībabhūva ।
sā kevalam hariṇaśāvakalocanā me
naivāpayāti hṛdayādadhidevateva ॥

"When all the objects of senses have been forgotten and learning acquired by exertion too has turned away its face from me (has left me), only the fawn-eyed lady, never disappears from my heart, like the deity presiding over it." (III, 3)

dhṛtvā padaskhalanabhītivaśātkaram me
yārūḍhavatyasi śilāśakalam vivāhe ।
sā mām vihāya kathamadya vilāsinī dyām
ārohasīti hṛdayam śatadhā prayāti ॥

"My heart breaks into hundred pieces, when I think how you, O beautiful one, should have now ascended the heaven without me, you, who at the time of the marriage stepped on to a slab of stone by holding my hand for support, through fear of slipping of your feet." (III, 5)

The fourth part is entirely devoted to glorification of Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu. In IV, 40 the poet attests through a pun and not directly that the wretched, who do not get pleasure from the "songs of Jagannātha" - *jagannāthabhaṇiteḥ* - that can mean so much as the Bhagavadgītā, are already dead, although they may be alive.." [Jagannātha is credited also with the authorship of an ornate didactic poem Aśvadhāṭīkāvya [1], so named on account of the fact that it is composed in verses written in the aśvadhāṭī metre].

Greater or smaller didactic poems on some topics, either religious or secular, are associated with some gnomic stanzas. A famous religious gnomic poem is Mohamudgara, "Hammer for Confusion" containing 17 or 18 rhyming stanzas,[2]

[1. Ed. with a commentary in Subhaṣitaratnākara, Bombay 1918.]

2. Text in Haeberlin 265 ff. and A. Hoefer Sanskrit—Lesebuch 74 ff. The text with English translation has been published by W. Jones in As. Res. 1, 34 ff. After this translation Herder gave a free rendering of some of the stanzas of the poem in "Die Entzauberung, Lehre der Braminen" (Herders Werke, edited by P. Suphan, Vol. 26, 419, f.). German translation. by P. v. Bohlen, Das alte Indien, Königsberg 1830, p. 375 ff., by Bs Hirzel (Morgenblatt 1834), A. Hoefer, Ind. Gedichte II, 149, ff. and H. Brockhaus (Über den Druck sanskritischer Werke mit lateinischen Buchstaben, Leipzig, 1841, 85 ff.). Text with French transl. by F. Nève in JA, 1841, s. 3, t. XII, 607 ff.

that are attributed to Śaṅkara. The verses describe the voidness of the universe and blessings of mental peace and of knowledge of Viṣṇu. A few verses are quoted below:—

mā kuru dhanajanayauvanagarvaṁ
harati nimeṣātkālaḥ sarvam ।
māyāmayamidamakhilaṁ hitvā
brahmapadaṁ praviśa suviditvā ॥

"Be not proud of your wealth or youth,
Not of your men: time rolls all in a moment;
Away from all that is pervaded by Māyā,
Know the Highest Lord and reach him without delay."

yāvajjananaṁ tāvanmaraṇaṁ tāvajjananījaṭhare śayanam ।
iti saṁsāre sphuṭataradoṣaḥ kathamiha mānava tava santoṣaḥ ॥

"How often are we born? How often dead? How long lying in mother's womb? How great is the prevalence of vice in this world? Wherefore, O man, art thou satisfied here?"

suravaramandiratarutalavāsaḥ
śayyā bhūtalamajinaṁ vāsaḥ ।
sarvaparigrahabhogatyāgaḥ
kasya sukhaṁ na karoti virāgaḥ ॥

"To dwell under the mansions of the high-gods at the foot of a tree, to have the ground for a bed, and a hide for vesture; to renounce all extrinsic enjoyments; whom does not such devotion fill with delight?"

To Śaṅkara is attributed also the Śataślokī, a gnomic poem in 101 sragdharā stanzas, in which the teachings of Vedānta have been set forth partly in figurative language[1].

The Cātakāṣṭaka[2] "The Eight Strophes of Cātaka" is a very famous ornate poem, that is partly lyrical and partly gnomic, of an unknown writer and of an unknown age. The bird cātaka, according to the Indian belief, has the rare peculiarity that it does not drink any water, other than the pure liquid of the cloud, and rather remains thirsty, but does not in any case drink the terrestrial water of streams, lakes and swamps.

1. Select works of Srī Sankaracharya, p. 85 ff.

2. There are old and recent poems of this name (Pūrva - and Uttara-Cātakāṣṭaka), both in Haeberlin 237 ff. Edited and translated into German by H. Ewald in Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, IV, Bonn 1842, p. 366 ff. German by Hoefer, Ind. Gedichte II, 161 ff.; English by Cowell, JRAS 1891, 599 ff.

Hence it always flies high up in the sky to ask the cloud for its drink. The Indian poets have special fascination for describing in lyrical stanzas the longings of the cātaka for the cloud, and proverbially the bird is the model of the noble person who scorns at all meanness in contempt and maintains his honour.

A religious and philosophical poem of an unknown age is the Viṣṇubhaktikalpalatā[1] of Puruṣottama, son of Viṣṇu. The theme of the poem is meditation and exhuberance of devotion for God Viṣṇu. In the 17th century Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita wrote one Śāntivilāsa[2], a poem of 51 stanzas in simple and unartificial language on the "Charm of Peace of Soul". The same Nīlakaṇṭha is the writer of an apparently uninteresting gnomic poem Kaliviḍambana[3].

As in the case of lyric, so in the case of gnomic poetry too, we find sometimes admixture of religion and erotic. A work of this type is the Rasikarañjana, written at Ayodhyā in the year 1524 by Rāmacandra, son of Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa, a poem that permits of a two-fold interpretation, in which each stanza can be taken as having an erotic as well as an ascetic meaning.

Partly erotic and partly theosophical is also the Śṛṅgārajñānanirṇaya, "Distinction between Love and Knowledge", contained in a dialogue between Śuka and Rambhā (Rambhāśukasaṁvāda) by an obscure author of an obscure age. They are stanzas with the refrain "*vṛthā gataṁ tasya narasya jīvitam* : useless is the life of that man". Rambhā throughout recites stanzas composed in the lucid language of Indian erotics and containing the idea" "useless is the life of the man, who has not tasted love", that is retorted by Śuka in a stanza in which

1. Edited with commentary in Km. 31, 1892, Cf. Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1475 f.

2. Edited in Km. Part VI, 1890, 12 ff.

3. Edited in Km. Part V, 1888.

4. Edited in Km., Part IV, 80 ff. with a commentary, without which the text cannot be understood. Published for private circulation and translated into German by R. Schmidt, Stuttgart 1896; cf. his 'Liebe und Ehe in the alten und modernen Indien, Berlin in 1904, 31 ff.

5. J.-M. Grandjean, Dialogue de Śuka et de Rambhā sur l'amour et la science suprême: Texte (32 stanzas) with French translation in the Annales du Musée Guimet t. X, 1887, 477 ff.

it is said "vain is the life of the man, who has not attained the highest wisdom, who has not worshipped Nārāyaṇa" etc.

Exclusively erotic is the subject-matter of the gnomic poem of the Kashmirian poet D ā m o d a r a g u p t a , who was the chief minister of King Jayāpīḍa (end of the 8th century A.D.). His k u ṭ ṭ a n ī m a t a[1], "Teachings of the Procuress," is an instructive poem in kāvya-style, in which a prostitute is being instructed by a procuress as to how she should feign true love for a rich young man and employ all the arts of erotics without letting him take note of the fact that all this is done simply for extracting money from him. The poet tries to parade his knowledge of alaṅkāraśāstra, of Sanskrit vocabulary as well as of the kāmaśāstra. Since Kalhaṇa calls him a poet (kavi) and verses from the Kuṭṭanīmata are quoted in treatises on poetics[2] this work has to be considered as an ornate poem according to the opinion of the Indians, although western scholars would include it in the works on pornography. In verses 778 ff. it has been described how a prostitute shows her skill as an actress in staging the drama Ratnāvalī, in which an interesting peculiarity of representation has been demonstrated.

A work of a similar type, perhaps an imitation of the Kuṭṭanīmata is K ṣ e m e n d r a's S a m a y a m ā t ṛ k ā completed in 1050 A. D. This prolific-writer, whom we have met so many times and whom we shall meet again, has worked in all the spheres. Throughout the period Kṣemendra worked as a poet, he always remained basically a scholar-teacher and his poems are all the more or less gnomic poems, whether they fall within the region of religion and morality or in that of erotics. The S a m a y a m ā t ṛ k ā is of interest also from the view-point of

1. Edited in Km., Part III, 1887 32 ff. The German translation of J. J. M e y e r , Altindische Schelmenbücher II, Lotos-Verlag, Leipzig, (1903). [Beside the title Kuṭṭanīmata there appears also the (synonymous) title Śambhalīmata. [Cf. also Dasharatha S h a r m a in COJ, I, 1934, 348 ff.].

2. Rājataraṅgiṇī 4, 496, Mammaṭa and Ruyyaka cite stanzas from the Kuṭṭanīmata. B ü h l e r (Ind. Ant. 14, 1885. 354) mentions the work as "an early specimen of Indian pornography". J. J. M e y e r has overrated the poet and his this work terribly.

3. Edited in Km., 10, 1888. Rendered into German by J. J. M e y e r loc. cit. Meyer translates the title as "Charm Book for Prostitutes" that can with difficulty be justified with the help of I, 3. But according to VIII, 127 and 129 Samayamatṛkā simply means "the procuress" or literally "teaching mother" i.e. to say "she, who is the mother (of the harlot) through her teachings" (and not a physical mother).

cultural history and is partly more brilliant than the work of Dāmodaragupta.

So is the description of the life of the procuress in chapter II not devoid of interest. As a girl of seven years, she happens to become a thief and a harlot at the same time, marries several men one after another, lives as a rich widow and in turn is a thief, nun, procuress, female swindler, a wealthy public house-keeper, food-vendor, beggar, flower-dealer, sorceress, landlady, holy Brāhmaṇa lady and lastly again a procuress. She is brought to the harlot Kalāvatī by a barber, who is depicted in a very realistic manner, for the purpose of training her in the exacting profession. She is now old and has become repulsive—IV. 7.

ulūkavadanā kākagrīvā mārjāralocanā ।
nirmitā prāṇināmaṅgairiva nityavirodhinām ॥

"Owl-faced, crow-necked and cat-eyed, she was,
it seems, as if created with the parts of the body of the
everlasting devilish animals."

Highly witty, although not always tasteful, anecdotes are inserted into the teaching of the procuress, and lastly it is narrated, how a young trader is cheated by the harlot and her "mother" and her father, an old niggard is swindled.

Notwithstanding the boundless desire of the writer to make it a book of moral lessons, this work too has fallen within the boundary of pornography[1]. The Kalāvilāsa[2] of Kṣemendra has a greater value from the point of view of cultural history and literature. It is a poem having morality as its subject-matter and is divided into ten sections on various occupations and follies. As in his all other works, here too Kṣemendra is a tedious and biting pedant. Still he exhibits great experience of life and knowledge of man and

1. Rightly remarks Pischel (DLZ, 1903, p. 3002) that Samayamātṛkā and Kuṭṭanīmata are not "rogue books", and notwithstanding their obscene subject-matter they follow a decent line.

2. Edited in Km. Part 1, 34 ff. One of the manuscripts described by Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. VII, p. 1491 f. has only 9 sargas. Translated into German by R. Schmidt in the "Festgabe ehemaliger Schüler zum 70. Geburtstag des Professors Ernst Mehliss in Eisleben" 1914 and in WZKM 28, 1914 406 ff. Cf. J. J. Meyer, Altindische Schelmenbücher 1, p. XL ff.

speaks about many things and men about whom other writers rerely report.

The sales-man Hiraṇyagupta brings his son Candragupta to Mūladeva, the famous teacher of all sorts of wickedness, and requests him to undertake training of his son. Mūladeva agrees, takes the young man to his house and trains him in all arts, trickeries and cunning. The teachings of Mūladeva form the subject-matter of the book. At the central point of all sorts of cheatings and pranks stands h y p o c r i s y . The religious hyprocrites have been particularly subjected to description, full of satires, concerning their life, and finally a story is told (I, 65 ff.) about the creation of Dambha (hypocrisy). This Dambha is painted as a great sage (muni) with holy grass, a book, a garland, "a staff of which the horn-handle is as croocked as his heart", muttering prayers with rosary in his hand etc. He appears to be such a great saint that the seven sages offer him the highest respects. The creator Brahman himself praises him for his extraordinary penance; but even in Brahman's mansion he requests the god to speak slowly and to close his mouth with his hand so that he may not get polluted with his breath. This Dambha descends upon the earth too and influences in thousand ways all beings. For ever he has pitched his tent in the moon and on the face of the high officials, and has captivated also the hearts of ascetics, astrologers, physicians, servants, traders, goldsmith, actors, soldiers, singers, bards, wizards, birds like the cranes, that stand like sages on the beach and the trees that dress themselves in bark as ascetics.

In section VII the poet turns severely against the touring people like singers and bards, who are described as real gyspies. They go round carrying their utensils, things in carts with several children and dishevelled hair and rob the rich of their gold; but still they have nothing, as whatever they earn in the morning they already sqander by midday. The goldsmith, in section VIII, is described as arch-thief and swindler. A sample card of different types of swindlers is placed before us in chapter IX. There is a physician who just for gaining know-

ledge of his science administers his remedies to patients suffering from all sorts of diseases, one after another, has killed thousands of people and then becomes a famous person : then there is an astrologer, who with his facial contortions pretends to be meditating on the planets and is ready to predict whatever his clients wish to hear, but does not even know what his wife is doing behind his back: there is the seller of patent medicines, whose skull is as bald as a copper kettle, but he is yet prepared to guarantee an infallible cure for baldness and finds purchasers, etc.

A poem, teaching moral like Kalāvilāsa, is the Darpadalana[1], "Smashing of Pride", of Kṣemendra. Here in seven sections have been described the seven types of pride. Alternating with gnomic stanzas, it has proved how thoughtless and useless the pride is, no matter due to high birth, riches, knowledge, beauty, heroism, charity or ascetism. Each section begins with a series of gnomic expressions, then follows the narrative, in which the leading character delivers a long speech which is not different in meaning from the maxims. The story told in section II is Buddhist. Buddha himself enters as "the friend of the unfortunate, the stream of pity". Then appears Śiva in section VII, where he "denounces the troubles of the world" and explains to his wife that some ascetics do not merit redemption, since notwithstanding their ascetism their passion still clings to them. In this otherwise tedious gnomic poem, here and there we find traces of humour: thus when the poet jeers at the learned and saints who have not been able to overcome their passions. A type of practical hand-book of morals is Caturvarga-saṁgraha[2], "Collection of (teaching on the) the Four Aims of Life". It is vain to find in this book anything that is original. Throughout the stanzas are prosaic; only the erotic stanzas in the section on pleasure of desire (kāma) the metres and style are poetical. The Sevya sevakopadeśa[3]

1. Extracts edited and translated by B. A. Hirszbant. Über Kṣemendras Darpadalana, St. Petersburg 1892 Complete text edited in Km., Part IV, 1890, 66 ff. and translated into German by R. Schmidt in ZDMG 69, 1915, 1 ff.

2. Edited in Km., Part V, 1888, 75 ff. Cf. Lévi, JA. 1885, s. 8, VI, 404 f.

3. Edited in Km., Part II, 1886, 79 ff

"Instruction for the Servant and the Served" in 61 stanzas deal with the subject of serving the master. The Cārucaryāśataka[1], "The Hundred Stanzas on Excellent Life", is tolerably a dull gnomic poem, in which have been described, the ways of life of pious and noble men, what he does and what he will like. In it myths and tales have been provided as examples.

Dyā Dviveda in his Nītimañjarī[2] utilized and imitated the Cārucaryāśataka of Kṣemendra. The former is a collection of current maxims in ślokas, each of which in the attached prose commentary, written by the author himself, is illustrated through some stories occurring in the Ṛgveda. The work has 200 stanzas, that are divided into 8 chapters corresponding to the 8 aṣṭakas of the Ṛgveda. The author has quoted copiously from Sāyaṇa's commentary on the Ṛgveda; hence he could not have lived before 15th century A.D[3]. The work is of importance for Brāhmaṇical fable-literature. But the maxims themselves do not have anything of importance.

A mention has still to be made of Mugdhopadeśa[4] "Instruction for the Fool" by the Kashmirian poet Jalhaṇa of the 12th century A.D., a gnomic poem in 60 stanzas that contains warnings against the snares of harlots.

Anthologies

Gnomic and lyric stanzas in a very large number are found in anthologies, in which generally the names of the poets of individual stanzas are also given. Although such statements are not reliable in all cases, still we are able to learn from these collections about a large number of names of otherwise unknown poets, and many stanzas of high poetical value have in this way come down to us.

1. Edited in Km., Part II, 128 ff. Cf. Peterson, Rep. 1882-83, p 4 f.

2. Cf. F. Kielhorn, Ind. Ant. 5, 1876, 116 ff. and NGGW 1891, 182 ff.; A. B. Keith, JRAS 1900, 127 ff.; E. Sieg, Die Sagenstoffe des Ṛgveda, Stuttgart 1902, P. 37 ff.; A. A. Macdonell, Bṛhaddevatā, Ed. HOS Vol. 5, p. XVII ff. Winternitz knew of the work from Max Müller's MS. which was then in Tokyo.

3. According to Nilmani Chakravarti, JASB, 1907, p. 211 the date of the work would be 1494 A.D.; but see also A. B. Keith, JRAS, 1900, 796 ff.

4. Edited in Km. Part VIII, 1891, 125 ff.

Of unknown date is one Vajjālagga, a Prākrit anthology compiled by the Śvetāmbara Jaina Jayavallabha, hence also called Javallahaṁ[1]. The work stands out with its collection of stanzas[2] composed in the Āryā metre in Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī. The stanzas are arranged in chapters (vājjā) according to their subject-matter. Jayavallabha explicitly says that his idea was to collect the sayings of great poets on matters concerning the aims of life (dharma, artha, kāma). Still only one-third of the verses are gnomic and relate to the aims of life, whilst their two-thirds are erotic. The stanzas contain nothing about Jainism.

One of the oldest Sanskrit anthologies has been found in a 12th century manuscript in Nepal. Neither the title of the anthology nor the name of its compiler has come down to us. F.W. Thomas has edited it under the title Kavīndravacanasamuccaya[3]. One section of the work is devoted to Buddha and one to Avalokiteśvara, whilst the rest of the sections have the same themes as the other anthologies have. None of the large number of poets, whose verses have been included in this collection of 525 stanzas, is of an age posterior to 1000 A.D.

Saduktikarṇāmṛta or Sūktikarṇāmṛta[4] "The Ear-nectar of nice Sayings" of Śrīdharadāsa, son of Vaṭudāsa is a very extensive anthology compiled in the year 1205 A.D. Both the father and the son were in the service of Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal, and the collection contains verses mainly by Bengali poets, e.g. Dhoī and Jayadeva. In the

1. A Sanskrit rendering (chāyā) was written by Ratnadeva in the year 1336. Cf. Bhandarkar, Report 1883-84, pp. 17, 324, ff., Pischel, Grammatik der Prākrit Sprachen §§ 12 and 14; Jul. Laber, Über das Vajjālaggam des Jayavallabha, Bonner Diss., Leipzig 1913; H. Jacobi, Bhavisattakaha von Dhaṇavāla, p. 61 f.

2. Probably it had 700 stanzas as in the Sattasaī, although the two available recensions have only 692 and 652 stanzas respectively.

3. Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1912, Cf. Haraprasād; Report I, 20. f. The probable title is included in the introductory stanza.

4. Published in parts in Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1912. Aufrecht, ZDMG 36, 1882, 361 ff., 378 ff; 509 ff. gives abundant information with German translation of individual stanzas. Cf. Thomas 7 f. [Edited by Rāmāvatāra Śarmā, with a Critical Introduction in English, by Har Dutt Sharma and an Introduction in Sanskrit by Padma Singh Sharma, POS, p. 10. 15, Lahore 1933. Cf. also Manomohan Chakravarti, JASB, 1906, p. 157-76; De, HSL, p. 413.]

entire work verses of 446 poets have been cited; amongst those of others of Gaṅgādhara, who is known from an inscription dated 1137 A.D. and of five other poets related to him, all of whom lived during 1050 and 1150 A.D.[1], Very important is also the Subhāṣitamuktāvalī. "A Chain of Pearls of Beautiful Sayings"[2] of Jalhaṇa, [1257 A. D.], who after his father Lakṣmīdeva became the advisor of the South Indian king Kṛṣṇa, who came to the throne in 1247 A.D.[3]. The anthology, of which there is a bigger recension as well as a smaller one, is arranged systematically. A section deals with poets and poetry and is of special importance for history of literature. Other sections contain stanzas on happiness, wealth, charity, fate, wickedness, wisdom, separation, union, misfortune, love, service to king, politics, etc. One of the most famous anthologies is the Śāraṅgadhara-paddhati[4] i.e. the Paddhati, "The Guide" (viz. of poetry) of Śāraṅgadhara", compiled in the year 1363 A.D.[5], The collection is divided into 163 sections according to the topics that have been treated. Often the names of the poets are appended to the stanzas; not seldom, however, is "somebody" given as the writer. Among these names occur nine names of poetesses. Śāraṅgadhara himself too is a poet, but the stanzas of which he calls himself the author are not significant. Amongst others, the verse No. 3927 is ascribed to Kālidāsa, that is:

payodharākāradharo hi kandukaḥ
kareṇa roṣādiva tāḍyate muhuḥ ।
itīva netrākṛtibhītamutpalaṁ
tasyāḥ prasādāya papāta pādayoḥ ॥

1. Cf. Kielhorn, NGGW, 1893, 196 ff.; Ep. Ind. 2, 330 ff.; M. Chakravarti, JASB, N. S., 2, 1906, 174 f.

2. The title occurs also as Sūktimālikā or Sūktimuktāvalī. Cf. Bhandarkar, Report 1887-91, pp. (I)-(LIV); Peterson, JBRAS 17, 1889, 57 ff; Thomas, 13 ff.

3. Cf. Bhandarkar, Early History of the Dekkan, 2nd ed.; Bombay 1895, 112 f. [De, HSL, p. 414, the name of his father was Lakṣmīdhara. The work has been edited by Embar Krishnamacharya, in GOS, Baroda 1938].

4. Ed. by P. Peterson, BSS, No. 37, 1888. The edition has 4689 stanzas, whilst in the 56th verse their number is given as 6300. Cf. Aufrecht, ZDMG, 25, 1871 455 ff; 27, 1873, 1 ff., where many verses have been translated as well: Böhtlingk, ZDMG, 27, 626 ff.

5. Hall, Vāsavadattā, Introd, p. 48. Śāraṅgadhara is the son of Dāmodara and the nephew of Rāghavadeva, who lived in the court of Hammīra of Śākambharī.

"The round ball resembles your round breasts,
That you always hit as if out of anger;
Therefore, perhaps on account of fear of your dark eyes,
The lotus has fallen from your breasts down :
It postrates at your feet in order to pacify you."

A beautiful stanza attributed to Bilhaṇa preserved in the Paddhati is No. 3427 :

aratiriyamupaiti māṁ na nidrā
gaṇayati tasyā guṇān mano na doṣam ।
vigalati rajanī na saṅgamāśā
vrajāti tanustanutāṁ na cānurāgaḥ ॥

"Anxiety afflicts me, sleep is shunning me from away;
My heart sees her noble qualities and not her errors;
The night is passing away, not my desire to meet her again;
My body is waning, but not the real love."

The verse No. 3953 attributed to Bhartṛmeṇṭha—

madhu ca vikasitotpalāvataṁśaṁ
śaśikarapallavitaṁ ca harmyapṛṣṭham ।
madanajanitavibhramā ca kāntā
phalamidamarthavatāṁ vibhūtayonyāḥ ॥

"A cup garlanded with blossoming lotuses,
A balcony illuminated with the beams of moonlight,
Marks of anguish on the face of a woman in love,
More than fortune, blesses it the wealth."

A useful maxim found in the Paddhati is:—

pratyahaṁ pratyavekṣeta naraścaritamātmanaḥ ।
kiṁ nu me paśubhistulyaṁ kiṁ nu satpuruṣairiti ॥

"Each day a man should examine his conduct and question himself—
What have I in common with the beasts and what with noble men."

Throughout copious is also the Subhāṣitāvali[3] of Vallabhadeva, compiled apparently with utilization

1. "So wrote, of course, Kālidāsa, and none after him"—remarks Aufrecht, ZDMG, 27, 17.

2. Translated into German by Aufrecht, ZDMG 37, 59 f.

3. Ed. by P. Peterson and Pandit Durgā Prasāda, BSS, 1886. Cf. Bühler, Ind. Ant. 15, 1886, 240 ff.; German translation of a number of stanzas by Aufrecht, Ind. Stud. 16, 209 f. and 17. 168 ff. Barth in Revue erit. 1887, 1, p. 421 ff. and C. Cappeller in the Album Kern 239 ff. have contributed towards textual criticism.

of the Śāraṅgadharapaddhati in the 16th century[1]. We are not in a position to assert whether a stanza attributed to Vallabhadeva in this work is a composition of the compilor himself or from the pen of some other poet. The anthology contains 3527 stanzas of more than 350 different poets. The stanzas 1119-1127 contain the whole of the canto XI of Maṅkha's Śrīkaṇṭhacarita, from which further extracts are given in 1444-1448 and 1659-1663. The verses are arranged according to the subject-matter. At least two deserve to be quoted here. One (1353) of them is attributed the Bhāsa, for whom it may be suitable:—

duḥkhārte mayi duḥkhitā bhavati yā hṛṣṭe prahṛṣṭā tathā
dīne dainyamupaiti roṣaparuṣe pathyaṁ vaco bhāṣate ।
kālaṁ vetti kathāḥ karoti nipuṇā matsaṁstave rajyati
bhāryā mantrivara sakhā parijanaḥ saikā bahutvaṁ gatā ॥

"She is deeply aggrieved, when I am in pain,
She becomes happy when I am so,
When I am sad, she gets sadness,
When I am angry and become harsh,
She speaks wholesome words ;
She knows the time, she talks cleverly,
And is pleased when I am praised:
Wife, a wise advisor, friend, servant :
She alone, she has become many."

A beautiful gnomic stanza of an unknown writer is No. 225:

nirguṇeṣvapi sattveṣu dayāṁ kurvanti sādhavaḥ ।
nahi saṁharate jyotsnāṁ candraścāṇḍālaveśmani ॥

"The noble show pity even to the being that has no

1. So according to Aufrecht, CC. 555. According to Peterson Subh. 114 he could not have lived before Jainollābadīn (1417-1467). [His name was Kāshmīraka Vallabhadeva and was directly quoted by Sarvānanda in his commentary on the Amarakośa. This has been taken note of by WK, p. 180, and here the time has not been given so definitely, but it has been said that in the form in which the Subhāṣitāvalī is available, it could not have originated earlier than the 15th century, since Jonarāja, who died in 1459, has been quoted above. A compromise has been sought to be made by assuming the presence of its earlier recension from which Sarvānanda might have quoted in 1160 A. D.—De, HSL, p. 413.]

2. These words remind of the stanza No. 66 of canto VIII of the Raghuvaṁśa, where probably Kālidāsa had in mind this verse of Bhāsa.

quality: the moon does not stop his rays from entering into the house of a Cāṇḍāla."

There is another Subhāṣitāvalī by one Śrīvara, the son or disciple of Jonarāja (2nd half of the 15th century). This anthology contains stanzas by more than 380 poets[1]. Down upto the recent times anthologies have been compiled[2]. The most copious anthology, especially of gnomic stanzas, has been compiled and translated into German by the German scholar Otto Böhtlingk in his volumes of "Indische Sprüche[3]."

DRAMATIC POETRY[4]

Early History of the Drama

The most valuable testimony of court ornate poetry is the drama. And when the Indian poeticians say that drama is

1. Bühler, Report 61; Peterson, OC VI, Leiden 1883, III, 2, 339. One more Subhāṣitāvalī of Sumati (?), see Ind. Off. Cat. 1533 f.

2. Worthy of mention are the anthologies Padyāvalī, the anthology devoted to the praise of Kṛṣṇa of Rūpa Gosvāmin (Ind. Off. Cat. 1534 ff.; Pischel, HL 9ff., 25; Thomas 11), probably of the 17th century A.D., [critically edited by S. K. De, Dacca, 1934; cf. also. COJ, II, 277 ff.], Padyaveṇī of Veṇīdatta, descendant of Nīlakaṇṭha and Padyāmṛtaraṅgiṇī of Bhāskara, son of Āpājibhaṭṭa (Bhandarkar, Report 1887-91, p. (LX) ff.; and Aufrecht, ZDMG 37, 1883, 544ff.; Thomas, 10f.); Hariharasubhāṣita of Harihara (published in Km. 86, 1905), perhaps identical with Harihārāvali (or Hārāvali or Subhāṣitahārāvali) of a poet Hari, who was a contemporary of Akbar, the Great, and had assumed the title of "Akbarīyakālidāsa" (see Peterson, Report II, 57 ff.; Krishnamacharya 126; Thomas 14), Padyaracanā of Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa Aṅkolakara (published in Km. 89, 1908), Anyoktimuktāvalī of Haṁsavijaya Gaṇi (published in Km. 88, 1907), perhaps an independent work written in 1679, A.D. (see Guérinot, JA, 1909, s. 10, t. XIV, p. 47 ff; No. 1106), Padyasaṁgraha of Kavibhaṭṭakṛtala (Haeberlin 529 ff.). Compiled in the early 19th century are the anthologies Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra of K. T. Parav (Bombay 1886, new edition, 1891; cf. Hertel, WZKM 22, 1908, 119 f. and Subhāṣitaratnākara of K. Bhāṭavadekara (Bombay 1872, new edition 1888). See also Thomas 10 ff. In the addenda W. says that Hariharasubhāṣita and Harihārāvalī are two different works. [See also Sūktimuktāvalī of Harihara, edited by Ramānātha Jhā, Patna, 1949.]

3. Sanskrit und Deutsch. 2. Aufl., St. Petersburg 1870-73, 3 vols. with 7613 epigrammatic stanzas: Index to it by A. Blau, Leipzig 1893 (AKM IX, 4). A selection from these epigrammatic stanzas has been rendered into German verses by L. Fritze, (Indische Sprüche, Leipzig, Reclam. Univ. Bibl.). The Indian fashion of composing epigrammatic poems was taken over to Pāli literature; see. J. Gray, Ancient Proverbs and Maxims from Burmese Sources or the Nīti Literature of Burma, London 1886.

4. Literature on drama in general: H. H. Wilson, Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus, London 1827 (Works, Vol. XI, XII); Theater der Hindus, aus dem Englischen übersetzt, 2 Teile, Weimar 1828, 1831; Sylvain Lévi, Le Théatre Indien, Paris 1890; J. L. Klein, Geschichte

the best type of poetical composition[1], we should probably insert into their statement that it is the best for the reason that in it other types of poetical compositions too are included and epic, lyric and imitative representations of life are united into a single artistic whole. This union of all the literary skills is, however, not the highest objective, but nevertheless in its still undeveloped form, it is the starting point of poetry. Rightly remarks E. Grosse[2] that almost "every primitive story is a drama", since the narrator is not satisfied by just telling his story in a simple manner, but he makes his work lively with the help of corresponding mimic intonations and gesticulations—he represents the event dramatically, so that in a certain sense the drama is the beginning of all types of poetry. And an American scholar[3], from a study of the ballads of different nations, has shown that recitation of ballads was originally always combined with music and dramatic dance, so that the statement that popular drama developed from such dance-music appears to be correct.

des Dramas, 3rd vol. Leipzig 1866; M. Schuyler, A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Drama, New York 1906 (CUIS 3); R. Pischel, GGA. 1883, p. 1217 ff.; 1891, p. 353ff.; A. Barth, Revue critique 1892, p. 185 ff.; G. A. Grierson, Ind. Ant. 23, 1894, p. 109 ff.; A. Hillebrandt, Alt-Indien, p. 150 ff. and Über die Anfänge des indischen Dramas (SBay. A. 1914. 4. Abh.); E. J. Rapson in ERE IV, 883 ff.; Winternitz, Österr. Monatsschrift für den Orient 41, 1915, 173 ff.; H. Lüders., Die Śaubhikas, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des indischen Dramas, SBA 1916, 698 ff., Oldenberg—Die Literatur des alten Indien, Stuttgart and Berlin 1903; Sten Konow, Indian Drama, Grundriss: II.; 2 D, 1920. Keith. The Sanskrit Drama, London 1924, 1954 and JRAS, 1916. On the Origin of Indian drama see also A. B. Keith, JRAS 1916, 146 ff. and Sten Konow in the Archiv für Culturgeschichte 14, 1219, 321 ff. W. says in the addenda that printing of the section on drama in his HIL was over when Sten Konow's Das indische Drama was published. [See also D. R. Mankad: The Types of Sanskrit Drama, Karanchi, 1936; R. V. Jagirdar, Drama in Sanskrit Literature, Bombay 1947; Chandra Bhan Gupta. The Indian Theatre, Banaras, 1954.]

1. So already Vāmana, Kāvyālaṁkāra; 1, 3, 31; cf. Gaṅgānāth Jhā in the foreword to his edition of the Kāvyaprakāśa (Pandit, Vol. 21, p. XIV). Similarly R. Gottschall (Poetik, 2nd ed., Breslau 1870, II, 184): "The drama is the blossom of poetry, the union of the epic and the lyric in the uninterrupted vivacity of an actual performance developing itself in the spirit of the age to come."

2. Anfänge der Kunst, Freigburg i. B. and Leipzig 1894, 253 f. Even children and uneducated persons are "not in a position to directly communicate any idea without having the corresponding countenance and gesticulation." Silent pantomimes played in Australia are extremely full of actions (Grosse, ibid 256 f.).

3. G. Morey Miller, The Dramatic Element in the Popular Ballad 1905; (University Studies of the University of Cincinnati, s. II, vol. I, No. 1, 1905, particularly p. 17 ff.). He calls these pieces "ballad-plays".

In India too, the drama has at least one of its main roots in such proto-ballad poetry, that we have seen continued from the Veda down through the epic, purāṇic, Buddhist and Jaina literatures, and in it we are obliged to trace the origin of old Indian epics. In the same way in which the epic developed from these ballads, while the narrative moment became more prominent in the face of the dramatic-dialogical foreground, the drama developed from the dramatic elements of these same ballads. Since in our opinion in earlier ages poetry of the type of these ballads could not have a wider circle of listeners, otherwise than by means of lively recitation combined with mimiçry, the origin of drama is capable of being easily explained from this type of poetry. It is also understandable that there are many scholars who will like to see real drama in this balladic poetry[1].

1. See addenda to Vol. I, p. 89, not included in the transl. : [That the dialogue-songs of the Ṛgveda, that have been termed as the "ākhyānat hymns" by Oldenberg, are to be entirely explained in the manner that that they go back to stories in mixed prose and verse of which we have now before us only the poetical dialogues, and that have not come down to us directly. These dialogical songs can best be designated as ballads. We can translate ākhyāna straightway as "ballad", in case we understand by it a dramatic narration in the form of dialogues, that are either wholly in verse or in verse mixed with prose. We already have come across such ballad poetry in the purāṇas (I, 469; trans. p. 560-61), in the Jaina Uttarajjhayaṇa (II, 312 ff.) but quite especially in Buddhist literature. S. Lévi (Le Théatre Indien, p. 301 ff.), J. Hertel (WZKM 18, 1904, 59ff., 137ff.) and L. v. Schroeder (Mysterium und Mimus im Rigveda, Leipzig 1908) have tried to find in these dialogue-songs more or less perfect dramas. Probably they are not so; on the other hand, they are primary rudiments of real dramas, and in fact many of the ākhyānas can be considered to be a type of primitive dramas or ballad likewise. Cf. above. vol. 1, p. 161 f.; trans., p. 184f.). A. Barth (RHR 19, 1889, 130f. Oeuvres II, 5 f.) has already stated that we cannot think of a better pendant to the narrative of Purūravas and Urvaśī in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa—than the ballad of King Rasālū in Tempple's "Legends of the Panjāb". J. Hertel (Indische Märchen, p. 344, 367 f.) compares the Suparṇākhyana, designated by him as "vedisches Mysterium" with the swāngs of modern North-West India, that have been described by Temple as half epical and half dramatic.

The Suparṇādhyāya (Sauparṇa, Suparṇākhyāna) is an apocryphal work of the late Vedic period, of which the author spasmodically tries to imitate the hymns of Ṛgveda in respect of the language, accentuation and external form, with the intention of letting his work pass for one as belonging to the Ṛgveda. The age of this work is wholly indefinite, and the opinion of Hertel that it is more than 2500 years old has not been prcved. Hertel (WZKM 23, 1909, 273 ff.) tries to prove that the poem, the theme of which is the well-known purāṇic story of Kadru, Vinatā and snakes (see above 1,232; transl. p. 389) and from which he has also given a German rendering (Indische Märchen. 1919) shows the existence of a dramatic poetry, that served as the connecting link between the "Vedic drama" the dialogue-verses of the Ṛgaveda and the classcical drama. Bnt the text that we have mearly a series of ballad. It is possible that it was meant to serve

The oldest ballad or dance-music of this type was, however, such in which stories of gods and demi-gods were narrated in sacrifices and feasts. Since, as in the case of other countries, so also in India, the drama has its deepest root in the religious cult. Already in the Vedic ritual texts several ceremonies are described that can straightway be designated as a type of drama[1]. In the post-Vedic period dramatic performance got associated with Indra's festival celebrated at the end of the rains, and more particularly with the cults of the gods Viṣṇu (Kṛṣṇa, Rāma) and Śiva[2]. The cult of Kṛṣṇa was especially associated with mimic dances. The Viṣṇupurāṇa (V, 13) describes how the cowherdesses got attracted by the nocturnal music of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma, flocked about the pastoral deity for the purpose of meeting him in the

for a dramatic representation. Cf. Oldenberg, Zur Geschichte der altindischen Prosa, p. 611 ff., also NGGW 1919 p. 79 ff. etc. and above II, p. 44 f. 98 A., 114, 119 A, 225; transl. pp. 59 f., 125 (note, 1), 140, 146 (note 2), 289. When Grierson had read the opinion of Winternitz on the Buddhist ākhyānas he wrote to him (9th and 19th Dec. 1912) that they reminded him of the khyāls of Rājasthānī, written in the Mārwāṛi-dialect. They contain a sort of popular sayings either in metrical dialogues or in prose narratives mixed with versified dialogues. They are either recited aloud by a single person or played on the stage, in which the stage-manager speaks out the narrative part, whilst individual actors recite their own parts. There is neither a scenery nor an introductory act. Hence they are also literary documents that may be designated as "ballads" or "dramas" likewise. E. Schagintweit, Indien in Wort und Bild II, p. 12 describes how up to these days the kathakas or "narrators", "the modern successor-representatives of the old Indian court-actors', practise their art; their articulation, supported with gesticulation, is adapted for fully poetical declamation: the pauses fill the music and their graceful dance", K. Rāmavarma Rājā (JRAS 1910, 637) describes the performance of dramas in modern Malabar by the so called Cakkyars, who entertain the audience on festive occasions with purāṇic narratives and moral preachings, of which the text, in general, is taken from prabandhas and campūs. In the description of these Malabar Brāhmaṇas, who are considered to represent the purāṇic sūtas, no sharp distinction is made between dramatic performances and epical recitations between actors and bards (naṭas and sūtas). It is also remarkable that in Sanskrit expressions like bhārata and kuśīlava, probably "bard-singer" can also be interpreted to mean "actor."

1. Cf. A. Hillebrandt, Die Sonnwendfeste in Altindien, p. 43, and Vedische Mythologie, I, 81.

2. Haraprasād Śāstrī (JASB, N. S. 5, 1909, 351 ff.) tries to prove that the Indian drama originated on the occasion of Indra's flag festival (*indradhvaja*); cf. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, Grundriss, III, 1 B, p. 125 f.). On the extensive contribution made by the Śiva-cult in the development of the drama see BLOCH, ZDMG 62, 1908, 655, and L. v. Schroeder, Mysterium und Mimus im Rigveda, p. 17 ff. On the Kṛṣṇa-cult and its importance for the drama see Winternitz, ZDMG 74, 1920, 118 ff. On the hypotheses of A. B. Keith (ZDMG 64, 1910) 534 ff. and JRAS 1912, 411 ff., see ibid p. 124.

rāsa-dance and dancing they "imitated the deeds and adventures of Kṛṣṇa". Exactly in the same manner, as the numerous facts regarding folklore prove, dance and mimic are inseparably associated with one another among the people, mostly also as constituent parts of religious or magical ceremonies[1]. And the mimic dances of the primitive people contain the germs of evolution of dramatic art—germs that have not bloomed so luxuriantly in any country as in Greece and in India.

The terminology of the drama further proves that in India too such dances were at the root of dramatic performances. The common word for "drama" in Sanskrit is the neuter n ā ṭ a k a, and the same word as masculine has exactly the same meaning as *naṭa* "actor", whilst *n ā ṭ y a* means "mimic" or dramaturgy" and *n ā ṭ a y a t i* conveys the sense of "mimic representation". All these words go back to the root *naṭ*, a Prākrit form of the root *nart*, "to dance". The fact that the literary dramas, that we have, begin with an introductory prayer goes to prove that this mimic dance and the dramatic performance, that originated from it, constitute an essential element of the religious cult. This n ā n d ī is, however, just a remnant of a longer religious ceremony, a kind of consecration of the stage (p ū r v a r a ṅ g a). that preceded the performance and in which homage to the divinity was paid in the form of music, song and dance. This consecration of the stage is elaborately described in the Bhāratīyanāṭyaśāstra, where, however, Bharata remarks that it should not be of long duration, so that on its account the audience may not feel tired. Later it seems to have been shortened more and more and at last it got limited to the nāndī-song, that, however, could never be dropped[2]. The condition of

1. The Mexican spring and crop festivals, according to K. Th. P r e u s s (Archiv für Anthropologie 1904, p. 158 ff.), are celebrated with mimic dances and ceremonial dramas. The Javanese shadow-play too has a wholly religious character; see W. W. S k e a t, Malay Magic, London 1900, 503 ff. and H. B o h a t t a in Mitteilungen der Anthropolog. Ges. in Wien 1905, 278 ff. On China see W. G r u b e, Geschichte der Chinesischen Litteratur, p. 362 f.; 396; on Japan see K. F l o r e n z, Geschichte der japanischen Litteratur, p. 373 ff. In general cf. W. W u n d t, Võlkerpsychologie III, 2nd, edn. and L. v. S c h r o e d e r, ibid, passim.

2. Probably the nāndī was originally recited by the stage-manager (s ū t r a d h ā r a) in a prescribed manner. The Bhāratīyanāṭyaśāstra (5, 107 ff. G r o s s e t, 99 ff. Bombay Ed.) gives the text of one such nāndī, that is a wholly a simple prayer in ślokas. Like any piece of Indian poetry, that

the society in which during all the centuries tales about gods and religious legends, especially relating to Rāma and Kṛṣṇa have continued to provide the poets with plots for their dramas, and the fact that even Buddhist poets are found tempted to reproduce dramatically the scenes from the Buddha-legends goes to point to the religious origin of the drama. Even in present-day India popular dramas are staged on festive occasions and in holy places, and they still continue to be a religious affair[1].

As it is upto this day in India, during the pauses in the yātrās and in the dramas played during spring-festivals and on other occasions, the actors appear in grotesque garments and with painted faces and create all sorts of crude funs for cheering the audience[2], so already in early India sober dramatic and lively recitations were intercepted by popular plays, in which the artists, who entertained the assembly with presentation of scenes from actual life, appeared. We are in a position to infer the existence of such popular plays in ancient India from the fact that in earlier literatures—the post-Vedic epic, Buddhist texts—"comedians" (as we may always call them) are mentioned repeatedly in Sanskrit by the word and sometimes also by śāilūṣa or kuśīlava, expressions that later came to be used for "actors". They belonged to a class of touring actors, who were welcome on festive and ceremonial occasions in gatherings, but enjoyed a very inferior social status. In the Mahābhārata it is said at one place that one of the duties of the

begins with a benedictory expression. The poet writing a drama begins his work with one such, that in course of time usurped the place of nāndī. Consequently in our dramas the nāndī is composed always in the kāvya-style and that in a fully ornate metre.

1. So the Bhavāis in Gujarat (see H. H. Dhruva in OC IX, London 1, 305,307); the yātrās in Bengal (see Nisikānta Chattopādhyāya, Indische Essays, Zürich 1883, p. 1 ff.), that have, in most cases, been written by Brāhmaṇas; and likewise the swāṅgas of the Panjab, that are partly recited and sung and partly played as dramas by a priest with his associates on the occasions of religious festivals (see R.C. Temple, The Legends of the Panjāb 1, p. VIII and No. 6, 10, 15, 16, 18 and 30). R. C. Temple describes one of the plays representing the Rāma-legend, acted at Firozpūr on the occasion of the Dasaharā festival in the Ind. Ant. 10, 1881, 289f. : "in all the great ceremonies of the Kālī Pūjā and the Durgā Pūjā during the Basant (Vasanta) and the Holī, the plays are staged in India. In most cases these mimic representations still bear a religious character, e.g. they represent episodes from the legendary stories of the divinity, that is extolled." (F. Rossen, Die Indrasabhā des Amānat, Neuindiches Singspiel, Leipzig 1892, p. 1.

2. Nisikānta Chattopādhyāya, ibid, p. 10 f.

king was that he had to see that in his capital there were pugilists, dancers and comedians for the entertainment of the people. At another place here it is said, however, that the comedians (naṭas), dancers and singers, staying in a town, must thence be removed when it is seized by an enemy[1]. It is understandable that we have none of these popular pieces, that were obviously improvised to the greatest possible measure. They were planned just for some occasion and disappeard with it. They were hardly put to writing. But the ornate poets, who composed dramas, had seen such popular reproductions of scenes from actual life and probably they wished very much to create the same impression on the audience, and indeed they tried their best, not only to refine and improve upon them, but also to imitate them[2]. The dramas that we possess are nothing less than popular, and they wholly belong to ornate poetry, and in fact are composed exclusively for the cultured public, and often they are straightway meant only for persons endowed with highly refined literary taste.

In the different types of dramatic poetry and the most conspicuous characteristics of the Indian drama we find traces partly of primitive religious ballads or of dance-songs and partly of those of the popular mimus. The fact that the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra distinguishes between ten types of dramas (daśarūpa), of which we find examples in the extant literature for only some of them, proves that dramatic literature and the art of stage were very important and elaborate in India - a thing that we are able to conclude from the small amount of literature of the ancient times that we possess[3]. The ten types of drama are the following:—

1. The Nāṭaka. This is the most important form of drama and the rules prescribed for it, as given in the Nāṭya-

1. Mahābhār. 12, 69, 60: 3, 15, 14.

2. Lévi (329 f., 335) and Barth (Revue crit. 1886, p. 263) assume that a Prākrit drama, belonging to literature, preceded the Sanskrit drama; this they do without any solid evidence. The unwritten mimus, not literary Prākrit drama, is the precursor of the Sanskrit drama.

3. Konow, Indian drama p. 27 conversely concludes, on the basis of a large number of subsidiary dramas, "that dramatic poetry was still in its beginning and that they had not evolved any definite form". But the great number of uparūpakas, mentioned in later-day theoreticians, goes to show that with the growth of dramatic poetry its types and sub-types became more and more distinct.

śāstra, come in the first line[1]. The hero of a nāṭaka should always be an honourable or highly placed personality, a king, a demi-god or a god. The theme is to be taken either from mythology or from some old story, that can be modified in any manner at the option of the author. All the sentiments, especially those of love and heroism, should find expression in a nāṭaka. The language should necessarily be dignified and elevated. On the stage, there should be no crowding and only four to five persons should enter there at one time. A nāṭaka should have at least five or utmost ten acts[2].

2. The Prakaraṇa. This is distinguished from the nāṭaka inasmuch as in it the plot is a creation of the author and the hero is of an inferior status. He is a Brāhmaṇa, a minister, a grosser, etc., but never a king or a god. Slaves, epicurean, prostitutes etc. may appear in a prakaraṇa. It should have five to ten acts, and otherwise its requirements should be same as those of a nāṭaka.

3. The Bhāṇa. It is a monologue in one act. A sly worldling (viṭa) appears and narrates his jokes in conversation with imaginary persons, whose talk he repeats. All possible situations come to be represented and different sentiments are aroused through this conversation and through a great display of mimics. The fable is fashioned by the writer in a manner as he likes, and in most of the Bhāṇas, that we possess, it is erotic.

4. The Prahasana or farce in one or utmost in two acts. The theme, that is mostly erotic, is fabricated. The hero is an ascetic or a Brāhmaṇa, a king or a rogue, and the rest of the characters are courtiers, eunuchs, servants, beggars, bon-vivants (viṭa), villains, prostitutes and procuresses. It is meant to stimulate the sentiment of humour.

5. The Ḍima. It is a fantastical piece of show-play in four acts and it has as its theme some fable taken either from mythology or from popular sayings. Gods, demigods or demons appear as heroes. Excepting the sentiments of love and of humour any sentiment may be generated according to option.

1. In the titles of the dramas that we have and in the colophons of the manuscripts, every big drama is designated as a nāṭaka, even when according to the terminology of the Nāṭyaśāstra it should have been called otherwise.

2. In the pieces that we possess, seven acts are quite usual, but there are others that have even 14 acts.

6. The V y ā y o g a. It is a military show-play in one act. The theme is generally well known; the hero is a famous person and only a few women appear in it.

7. The S a m a v a k ā r a. This is a drama played in the heaven. In it gods and demons appear and the hero is a great and famous personality[1].

8. The V ī t h ī. A light single-act play, in which only two persons appear. It is a little different from Bhāṇa.

9. The U t s ṛ ṣ ṭ ā ṅ k a, shortly called also a ṅ k a[2], an one-act play, in which the sentiment of pathos (karuṇā) is dominant. The characters are generally human-being. Screaming of women occurs. The theme is some well-known story that is elaborated with interpolations.

10. The Ī h ā m ṛ g a. It is a play in four acts. Its theme is partly legendary and partly invented by the poet. The characters are either human or divine beings. There is the description of abduction of some divine female, but the battle that is to follow is avoided through artifice.

In addition to these ten principal types of dramatic k ā v y a (r ū p a k a s), we find an enumeration of eighteen subsidiary ones (u p a r ū p a k a s), in later-day treatises (e.g. V ī ś va-n ā t h a) on poetics. In them dance, music, song, and panto-mimic play a more prominent rôle than the literary characteristics. Only two of these uparūpakas deserve to be mentioned here : they are the n ā ṭ i k ā, that is intermediate between nāṭaka and prakaraṇa and has four acts, in which the sentiment of love is dominant, the women play the main rôle and there is much song, dance and music[3], and the t r o ṭ a k a, that has five to nine acts and is played partly in the human-world and partly in the divine world. Of the ten main types of dramas, the nāṭakas and the prakaraṇas are preponderantly

1. Bhār.-Nāṭyas. 18, 109. According to Daśarūpa 3,61 and Sāhitya-darpaṇa 515 ff. the samavakāra has a theme, such as, for example, the churning of the ocean, three acts, of which the duration is accurately observed, and twelve heroes.

2. The word a ṅ k a means "act" of a drama. The original meaning of the word apparently is "curve", "bending inward", hence "division" of a drama. L é v i, p. 58 holds a different view. According to poetics an "act" (aṅka) came to be so designated because the stage is not vacated, when one such is over.

3. The nāṭikā (Daśarūpa. 3, 46 ff.; Sāhityad. 539) corresponds to the n ā ṭ ī in Bhār. Nāṭyaś. 18, 106 ff.

represented among the pieces that have come down to us; the vyāyoga has several pieces; the bhāṇas and the prakaraṇas are represented only by pieces written in later days; the ḍima has only one specimen, that is an insignificant modern drama. The examples of nāṭikās are the dramas like the Ratnāvalī and the Priyadarśikā. A troṭaka is the Vikramorvaśīya of Kālidāsa. On the whole we can say that among the enumerated types of rūpakas and uparūpakas are to be found all the types of dramatic compositions, that are known to the people of the West: show-plays and pleasure-plays, song-plays, opera, ballets, burlesque and farce. Only o n e , namely the tragedy, has never existed in India. The best type of dramatic k ā v y a , the n ā ṭ a k a, is never a tragedy, but always what in the West is called a "show-play". Mostly it is serious and comic and its end can never be tragic. A tragic catastrophe—battle, defeat of the patron, death, siege of a city etc. must never be shown on the stage, but these can just be indicated in an interlude. The death of a hero or of a heroine, however, must never occur even in the interlude[1]. These rules hold good in full for the nāṭaka and also for the prakaraṇa and above-mentioned show-plays.

Now whilst the subject-matter of the drama shows greater affinity with early religious or semi-religious ballad-poetry in the portions dealing with mythological or epic materials in the n ā ṭ a k a s , the influence of popular drama holds the ground more in the p r a k a r a ṇ a , the "civic show-play". It is in the very nature of thing that the p r a k a r a ṇ a has very much in common with the narrative literature[2]. This too has, then, developed in dependence on popular models. The p r a h a s a n a , "farce", must have grown up directly from popular pieces. The influence of popular model is seen in

1. The basis of this precaution (Bhār. Nāṭyaś. 18, 18 ff.) is clearly avoidance of an evil omen. Daśarūpa, 3, 39ff. and Sāhityad., 278 further mention other things that should never take place on the stage: long travel, calling from a distance, uproar, speaking aloud of a curse, eating, bath, love-embrace, anointing, wearing of garment biting, scratching and other improper things. The dramas that are available do not always adhere to this rule. Interlude (viṣkambhaka or praveśaka) between two acts, in which a monologue or dialogue, that is not to be presented on the stage is communicated, is found in all the big dramas.

2. Cf. L. H. G r ay , The Sanskrit Novel and the Sanskrit Drama, WZKM 18, 1904, 48 ff. Mimos and aretalogy (tale and adventure romance) stand beside one another in Greece too,; see R. R e i t z e n s t e i n , Hellenistische Wunderzählungen, Leipzig, 1906, p. 12.

certain peculiarities, that are seen in all the dramas, including the nāṭaka, mentioned above. Besides, not-infrequent insertion of such popular scenes in which all sorts of persons of lowly classes appear, among its characteristics are the prelude, that gives a view of the improvised extempore conversation that takes place between the stage-manager and his wife or his assistants, the use of popular dialects beside Sanskrit and the rôle of the joker (vidūṣaka). These are the noteworthy characteristic peculiarities of the Indian drama.

It must first of all be mentioned that a drama begins with the nāndī, the introductory prayer. Immediately after the nāndī follows the prastāvanā, i.e. the prologue or the interlude. The sūtradhāra or stage-manager appears and starts talk with an actress, who is supposed to be his wife, or with his assistant, one of the actors, for the purpose of saying a few words in praise of the author of the piece[1], that is being staged, in order to attract the attention of the audience towards the play and to prepare them for its presentation. The interlude always ends with an allusion to the characters that are to appear in the particular play : thus for example in the Śakuntalā the stage-manager says: "Here comes King Duṣyanta."

This sūtradhāra[2] or stage-manager, according to our dramas, as also according to the Nāṭyaśāstra must be a highly cultured man. He should be capable of winning applause of the public not only in music and in the art of stage-technique, but should have command over language and should possess knowledge of poetics, prosody, art, astronomy, geography and history (that is the genealogy of royal families). His wife is presented in our dramas in the preludes as a nice house-wife. Since he has to perform also certain religious ceremonies, in the pūrvaraṅga, of the consecration of the stage, it may be assumed that he does not belong to a despised caste. It may further be assumed that, as in Greece, so in India too, "a part of the nimbus that surrounded religion" was for the bene-

1. This allusion to the author in the prelude is wanting only in the dramas of Bhāsa.

2. The sūtradhāra has two assistants, the sthāpaka (or sthapati) and the pāripārśvika. Sūtradhāra ("the holder of the measure-string)" as well as sthāpaka, "erector" originally meant "chamber-boy" or "builder". Apparently the duty of the sūtradhāra was to arrange for setting up of the tent of the theatre and to take care of the stage. Hence the name. Cf. Lassen, Indische Altertumskunde II, 503.

fit of the actor. But in fact, however, it appears that already in early times in India the actor enjoyed the same social status as in Rome, where slaves and enemies were trained as actors and the actresses as a rule were harlots[1]. Probably in ancient India, there were dramas of different types. In the earliest period, ecclesiastical dramas might have been played by Brāhmaṇas[2], and the actors, who were associated in the performance of sober ornate dramas, must have occupied a higher status than the comedians, who exhibited their skill in markets in unrefined popular dramas. From literature we learn that actors often enjoyed the patronage of kings and the relationship existing between actors and poets was very intimate.

The sūtradhāra was generally the main actor, who played the chief rôle, that is of the hero. In the Indian drama original characters are rare. Certain types mostly recur as a rule. Thus the hero or the lover is mostly young and handsome, refined and endowed with all good qualities, but he is always ardently loved as well. The heroine is always beautiful and full of love, but of different types, who is either the wife of the hero, or a different woman or a harlot. Of the other characters that appear in dramas the most remarkable person is the vidūṣaka or joker. As a rule he appears in prakaraṇas and mostly in other bigger dramas too. However, he is missing in such pieces of Bhāsa as have their plot taken from the

1. Cf. B. Warnecke in Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum usw. 33, 1914, p. 95 ff. In Indian literature, particularly in the the kāmaśāstra, there is hardly any difference between an actress and a harlot. It was one of the accomplishments of a harlot to win admiration with her skill even as an actress. Already during the age of Patañjali (2nd century A.D.) the naṭas belonged to despised and excommunicated classes, and the wives of the naṭas, who belonged to any man of their choice, are compared to consonants that can be combined with any vowel (Mahābhāṣya 6, 1, 2, Vārtt. 5). [The words are:—

vyañjanāni punarnaṭabhāryāvadbhavanti | tadyathā naṭānāṁ striyo raṅgagatā yo yaḥ prcchati - kasya yūyaṁ kasya yūyamiti | taṁ-taṁ tava tava-ityāhuḥ | evaṁ vyañjanānyapi yasya yasyācaḥ kāryamucyate taṁ taṁ bhajante ||

It can be translated as:—consonants are like wives of actors. As when on the stage whosoever asks the wife of an actor "Whose are you, whose are you", to him, she replies "Your, your"; so consonants come to the service of the vowels that have some prescribed work.] But are we to understand "actors" by the term naṭas ? In Manu (4, 214 f.; 10, 22) all sorts of stage-artists belong to impure classes as in Rudrayāmalatantra (see Colebrooke, Misc. Ess. II, 184 f.).

2. As even today the swāngs are staged in the Panjāb by priests; see above p. 183, footnote 1.

epics, that may be considered to be the direct successor of the old ballads. The vidūṣaka is always a Brāhmaṇa or rather a caricature of a Brāhmaṇa. He has a grotesque appearance in respect of his physique, dress and language. He is dwarfish, hump-backed, bald-headed, with protruding teeth and red eyes, voracious eater, quarrelsome, stupid and ignorant. But he is the trusted companion of the king, whom he always serves faithfully, but often in an uncouth manner, in his love adventures. He is freely teased by other characters. In the Nāṭyaśāstra he is depicted more grotesque than he appears in our dramas. In many of the classical dramas, the grotesque goes wholly into the background and the fidelity towards his friend comes to the forefront. It is very likely that the vidūṣaka has been taken over to the literary drama from the popular mimus[1]. Next to the vidūṣaka stands the v i ṭ a, one of the typical figures of the drama, although he too does not appear in all the pieces. This viṭa is compared with the parasite of the Attic comedy. He is an expert artist, who moves in the sphere of the world of love, but since he is reduced to poverty, he no more belongs to the world of lovers. He is a cultured talker, an admirer of beauty, and very often himself a poet, expert in the art of coquetry[2] and knows to act in different situations. In any case he belongs to the city-life and has been taken over probably also from popular plays, in which the activities of harlots and their associates are presented.

Lastly it may here be added that one of peculiar characteristics of the Indian drama is the great amount of variation in respect of the l a n g u a g e — a thing that too points to its development on the basis of popular models. To begin with, we find prose dialogues intercepted by verses

1. Cf. L é v i 358 f.; J. H u i z i n g a, De vidūṣaka in het indisch toonel, Groningen 1897; K o n o w, DLZ 1898, p. 1263ff.; M. S c h u y l e r in JAOS 20, 1899, 338 ff. The theory of popular origin of the vidūṣaka has been refuted by J. H e r t e l (LZB 1917, p. 1198 ff.; Jinakīrti's "Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla", p. 121 A.), who shows that the vidūṣaka, like the viṭa, appears in narrative literature in the retinue of the king, hence appertains to the court-life. Vidūṣaka and viṭa belong, however, as we learn from the Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana, where they appear in the retinue of the city-wordlings, not to the court-life particularly, but to the city-life. The epics too do not know about a vidūṣaka or a viṭa, being in the courts of the kings.

2. *veśyopacārakuśalaḥ*, Bhār.—Nāṭyaś. 24, 104, J. J. M e y e r, Altindische Schelmenbücher, I, p. XXIII ff. renders *viṭa* as "Hurenschranze (harlot's parasite)" and calls viṭas as "veterans of love."

composed in different metres, and these verses are partly recitative and partly musical. On the whole the drama is inseparably connected with music, song and dance. According to the treatises on dramaturgy, the ten types of songs that are to be sung either loudly or otherwise and constitute the essential part of woman's dance[1] form indispensable "ornaments" of the drama. But variation is not only between prose and verse, but the actors speak different dialects according to the characters they represent. Sanskrit is spoken only by members of higher classes, the hero of the piece, kings, Brāhmaṇas and men of rank and according to treatises also, by nuns, the first queens, minister's daughters and harlots. In the dramas that we have these women too, like all women on the whole, speak Prākrit[2]. The vidūṣaka, notwithstanding the fact that he is a Brāhmaṇa, speaks Prākrit ike uncultured people. Generally speaking the assignment of particular languages to particular characters was certainly meant just to reflect the conditions of real life[3]. In the Mṛcchakaṭikā the harlot Vasantasenā, therefore, speaks Prākrit as a rule, but Sanskrit in verses. The harlots, at whose place was witnessed much of social culture, understood it clearly and were capable of expressing themselves in Sanskrit as in Prākrit. Men, who speak Prākrit, sometimes go over to Sanskrit, particularly in verses. In Bhāsa's Pañcarātra Arjuna, in the guise of Eunuch Bṛhannalā, speaks Prākrit, but in conversation with his brother Yudhiṣṭhira, he speaks Sanskrit. And when King Virāṭa wants him to narrate the events of the battle and he as Bṛhannalā begins to narrate it in Prākrit the king interrupts him with the words, "It is an important work, speak in Sanskrit !" and he jumps over to Sanskrit. In the Mudrārākṣasa, there enters a spy as a snake-charmer, and in this rôle he speaks Prākrit; but the moment he is alone he speaks Sanskrit and discloses to the audience that really he is not a snake-charmer, but a man of a

1. Lāsya is the woman's dance as opposed to the tāṇḍya, the man's dance. Cf. Bhār. - Nāṭyas[1]. 18, 170 ff.; Daśarūpa 3, 54; Sāhityad. 504 ff; Lévi 119 f.

2. According to the Karpūramañjarī 1, 7 the difference between Sanskrit and Prākrit is like that between men and women. According to Sāhityad. 432, cultured women should speak the Śaurasenī dialect, and just occasionally Sanskrit for the purpose of showing their taste.

3. Cf. R. G. Bhandarkar, JBRAS 16, 1885, 337 f., 17, 6 ff.; Rapson, Thomas, Grierson and Fleet in JRAS 1904, pp. 455 f.; 470, 472 f. 482 and above I, 39 f.; transl. p. 43 ff.

higher caste.[1] The most important Prākrit dialects that occur in our dramas are: Māhārāṣṭrī, Śaurasenī, Māgadhī, Paiśācī and Apabhraṁśa. These "Prākrits" are not actual living speeches, but literary dialects, exactly as Sanskrit, that in any case were elevated from popular dialects, or in dependence upon popular dialects, they were refashioned for literary use[2]. In the Bhāratīyanāṭyaśāstra (17, 46), however, it is expressly laid down for actors that they can use at their option a provincial language in lieu of Śaurasenī.

In the same way as the drama reflects in certain measure the actual life in respect of the language, so also it stands in other respects always much closer to real life than the court epic. It is so by the very nature of the drama that—also according to the Indian definition of nāṭya—"it should be an imitation of life."

Many of the peculiarities of the drama, about which we assume that they originated in dependence upon old popular plays[3], are found in Greek mimus too. This poses the problem as to whether or not the acquaintance with setting of the Greek travelling theatre too has contributed to the origin of the literary drama in India.

The theory that the Indian drama developed under Greek influence is very strongly maintained and equally often refuted. First of all A. Weber[4] had expressed the idea that "perhaps the representation of Greek plays in the courts of Greek kings in Bactria, in the Punjab and in Gujarat had given impetus to the creation of the imitative art in India and had been

1. So in Bhāsa's Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa Rumaṇvat and Yaugandharāyaṇa in disguise speak Prākrit, but in soliloquy and among themselves they speak Sanskrit. In the Karṇabhāra of Bhāsa, Indra in the guise of a Brāhmaṇa-beggar speaks Prākrit, but in his soliloquy the god speaks Sanskrit.

2. On the Prākrit-dialects of dramas see Pischel, Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen (Grundriss, I, 8 also translated into English by Jhā), §§ 5 f. 11, 22-26, 28-30; Konow, GGA 1894, 478, ff.; JRAS 1901, 329 f. 1902, 434 ff.; Hillebrandt, GGA 1908, 99 ff. Hultzsch ZDMG 66, 1912, 709 ff. On the vibhāṣā mentioned by Grammarians of Prākrit, see Grierson, JRAS 1918, 489 ff.

3. It is important to remember in this context that we do not know this old Indian popular piece, but are able to conclude about its existence from the literary dramas of the West on one hand, and from the popular dramas of modern India on the other.

4. Ind. Literatur-geschichte, 2 Aufl., Berlin 1876, p. 224; Die Griechen in Indien, SBA, 1890, 920f.; [cf. IS. II, p. 148; xiii, 492, also Keith, Sanskrit Drama p. 57.]

at the root of the origin of Indian drama." E. Windisch has then, in a big essay[1], tried to prove in detail that Indian drama developed under the influence of Greek comedy. Jacobi, Pischel, L. v. Schroeder and S. Lévi had long ago pointed to the weakness of the argument of Windisch. Above all, there is nothing to prove that Greek dramas were ever actually staged in India. Chronology too does not go to attest the influence of Attic comedy on the development of Indian drama. The question was, however, raised in 1903 in a new stadium through the book "Der Mimus" of Hermann Reich. Reich traces the history of the mimus, the secular Greek drama, not only in the classical antiquity, but through the entire world literature, and tries to prove that this mimus reached India through the wandering folk of the Greek mimes. Indeed Reich shows a large number of correspondences between the Greek mimus and the Indian prakaraṇa, in which he repeats many of the arguments of Windisch. So the correspondence in relation to the theatre-curtain. Neither the Indian nor the Greek knew of a theatre-curtain in the modern sense that separated the stage from the auditorium, but the curtain formed the background for the stage and separated it from the dressing room (nepathya). To the Indian nepathya corresponds the Greek-Roman post-scene and the curtain to the siparium of the mimus. This curtain is called yavanikā in Sanskrit. "Greek (wand)"[2]. Other correspondences between the

1. "Der griechische Einfluss im indischen Drama" in OC V, Berlin 1882; Th. Bloch, a disciple of Windisch, believed in the year 1904 (ZDMG 58, 455 ff.) that there was a cave in Central India with a Greek theatre engraved in it. But on good grounds archeologists have refuted the hypothesis that here we have the case of a theatre; see J. Burgess, Ind. Ant. 34 1905, 197 ff.; C. Glanneau, Revue archéologique 1904, 142 f.; V. Golonbew, Ostasiat. Zeitschrift 3, 1914-15, 253 ff. Similarly Winternitz considers the researches of M. Lindenau, a disciple of Windisch (Beiträge zur altindischen Rasalehre, Leipzig, 1913, p. V f., and Festschrift Windisch, p. 38 ff.), trying to prove the relation between the Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra and the Poetics of Aristotle as failure. [On Indian and Greek dramas see also Windisch, Geschichte der Sanskrit Philologie, 1920, p. 398 ff.; R. G. Rawlinson, Intercourse between India and the Western World, Cambridge 1916, 169 ff.; G. N. Banerjee, Hellenism in Ancient India, Calcutta 1920, 240 ff. and Konow, ibid p. 40 f.; Keith, Sanskrit Drama, p. 57 ff.]

2. The word may mean, in any case, also "curtain" generally, and thence also a cloth made by Yavanas (Greek or Persian), something like "Persian carpet" as meant by Lévi. Since the Sanskrit word yavanikā

mimus and the Indian drama are the interchange between prose and verse, the use of popular dialects, and appearance of a large number of persons, including all types from the common people. The Indian sūtradhāra corresponds to the archimimus of the Greek-Roman band of actors, and his wife to the archimima. In ancient Greece the mimes were without fixed abode, as in India, they were touring people, and in both the countries actresses were harlots at the same time. The mimic theatre resembles in its simplicity to that of the Indian. The scenic apparatus was extremely moderate and simple, that mostly was left to the phantasy of the audience or was expressed only through guests. Hence the variegated change of scenes without unity of time or of place being observed[1]. A far-reaching similarity exists between the sannio of the mimus and the Indian vidūṣaka. The only difference is that the latter is always a Brāhmaṇa, whilst the joker in the mimus is either a slave or farmer. But since the same striking similarity between the joker of the Indian drama and that of the Greek mimus extends also up to the fools of the popular plays of most of the European nations, the possibility that this character has developed independently in different countries is not ruled out. In any case Reich believes to have proved that the Greek-influenced Roman mimus on its part influenced the popular dramas throughout the middle ages in the whole of Europe; it was so particularly in Italy. From Italy the mimus came to the court of Queen Elizabeth of England and there it influenced the art of Shakespeare. And thus is explained the really striking and often already noticed correspondences between Shakespearean and Indian dramas[2]. According to Reich this agreement is

occurs also in Bhāsa it does not seem likely that it is just a Sanskritisation of the Prākrit word javanikā, as opined by Pischel (GGA 1891, 354).

1. Bharata has indeed prescribed that an act should not contain events of more than one day, but poets do not strictly observe this rule. Often a single day is covered by many acts and it is not seldom that certain acts spread over several years. Cf. A. V. W. Jackson, Time Analysis of Sanskrit Plays, JAOS 20, 1899, 341 ff.; 21 1900, 88 ff.

2. Cf. L. v. Schroeder, ILC 602 f.; Reden und Aufsätze, p. 105; H. H. Wilson, Works, Vol. XI, p. XII; Reich, Mimus, 880 ff.; Klein, Geschichte des Dramas III, 87; A. V. W. Jackson, American Journal of Philology 19, 1898, 241 ff.; W. A. Clouston, Asiat. Quart. Review 10, 1890, 206 f. Striking is also the following correspondence: in India the colour of the curtain was different according to the sentiment of the drama: black for the serious, gay for the comic, white for the erotic and red for

explained quite simply through the fact that both of them go back to same old Greek source.

These circumstances seem to stand in support of the hypothesis that either the Indian drama-writer took the stimulus directly from the Greek mimes, or the Indian popular plays, that apparently served as model for the dramatic poetry, were influenced through the presentation of the Greek mimes. Both of the views may be possible. On the other hand, this too seems quite plausible that in India, as in Greece, there took place, already in early ages, popular performances by itinerant comedians, that independent of one another— served as a means of recreation for the people, and that all the really existing correspondences between the Greek mimus, the Indian drama and the drama of Shakespeare rest on the fact that the same goal was reached with the help of this very means. The Indian drama, as we know it, has throughout such a strong national Indian character that it stands against the hypothesis of any foreign influence on it. In the field of Indian astronomy, as in the case of Indian sculpture, Greek influence can be demonstrated easily. That certainly is not the case with the drama. Here we stand wholly on the Indian soil, and it is the Indian spirit, the national Indian life that we meet throughout in the Indian drama. It can probably be said that majority of researchers hold today the view that the Indian drama developed independently of any Greek influence. It appears, however, that this question cannot now be decided with certainty and perhaps will never be decided. If H. Reich says that in the world there is no dramatic poetry that is outside the Hellenic influence, Winternitz holds that the confidence with which he maintains this hypothesis is as much unsettled as that of Pischel, when he says : "It is for the Indians to refute flatly the hypothesis that the Greek mimus has some influence on the Orient. In case the influence was reciprocal the Greek were the borrower[1]."

those in which a fight and violence took place. In old English theatre too the colour of the curtain in tragic dramas was black and it was red in comedies.

1. SBA. 1906, 502; cf. GGA. 1891, 354 and DZL 1905, 541. In his rectorial address on "Die Heimat des Puppenspiels" (Halle 1900) R. Pischel has tried to prove that the Indian drama developed from the puppet- plays, that the origin of the comic character, the vidūṣaka, too is to be

The question of relationship between the Greek and Indian dramas cannot be answered with the help of conclusions of this sort. There is no decisive yes or no. In this case, the chronological possibility of a Greek influence cannot be refuted, as we possess trustworthy evidence proving the existence of a literary drama written in an age that is not earlier than that of which western countries have fragments of such dramas, hence not of a period anterior to the beginning of the Christian era.

In the whole of Vedic literature there is not a single sure evidence of presentation of a dramatic show and of the existence of a literary drama, even when more often there are topics that refer to singers, mimes and dancers. Among the naṭasūtras mentioned by Pāṇini we hardly find any mention of a manual on the art of dramaturgy of the type of our Bhāratīya-Nāṭyaśāstra, but rather of "rules for mimes", and indeed such as appear in religious mimic dances[1]. In Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, in the epics, in the Mahābhārata and in the Rāmāyaṇa, in the texts of the old Buddhist literature and in the Kauṭilīya Artha-śāstra we hear about reciters, singers, dancers and itinerant musicians of all types and of their shows and performances; but a literary drama and performance of any real drama are not attested to in any of these earlier works[2]. For the first time we come across a definite evidence of the existence of literary dramas in

found in the puppet-play and that the Gypsies had brought to Europe the puppet-play and with it the fool too. The expressions sūtradhāra and sthāpaka indicate, according to him (as also according to Shankar P. Pandit, Vikramorvaśīya, Ed. BSS 1879, Notes p. 4 and OC IX, London 1, 313f.), originally "string-holder" or "erector" (of the puppet). Cf. above p. 188. In case however, the native place of the puppet and the fool be in India, the fool of the Greek mimus too are to be deduced from the Indian puppet-play. The interpretations of Pischel, however, have rightly found not a single supporter among the especialists. In all probability the puppet-play, like the shadow-play (see Pischel, SBA 1906, 482 ff. and Lüders, SBA 1916, 698 ff.), is not the predecessor, but an off-shoot of the popular mimus.

1. Pāṇ, 4, 3, 110f. Cf. Winternitz, Österr. Monatsschrift f. d. Orient 41, 1915, p. 180 f.

2. On Patañjali see Winternitz, ZDMG 74, 1920, p. 118 ff. The word nāṭaka occurs in the whole of the Mahābhārata only once and even this single passage (2, 11, 36) is absolutely not certain; it is wanting in the South Indian manuscripts; see Winternitz JRAS 1903 571f. It is likewise doubtful whether in the Rāmāyaṇa, the passage II, 69, 4, where it is said that Bharata was glad at the "narration" of the "play" (nāṭaka) and "circular movement" or "wits" (hāsya), does not belong to the older portion of the epic, as the meaning of nāṭaka in the context is doubtful.

the Harivaṁśa, of which the time is wholly indefinite, and in the Buddhist Sanskrit texts of the first century A.D. Now it is almost settled that Buddhists first of all introduced drama into literature. Rather we must assume that the court-poetry belonging to secular Sanskrit drama preceded the Buddhist Sanskrit dramas of the first century A.D. We need not, however, hence go back further than the first century B. C. or beyond the first century A.D. During this period, however, there were many cases of Greek influence on India, above all on the Greeko-Buddhist sculpture[1] influenced by the Greek art. Hence it is in any case probable that during this age numerous germs of development of a literary drama, that had existed in India from the earliest times, attained maturity under the influence of Greek mimes. But we cannot accede anything beyond a mere probability.

THE BUDDHIST DRAMAS[2]

The first definite and to a certain extent dated testimony of the existence of a literary Buddhist drama in India, we find as already mentioned above, in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature. In the Avadānaśataka it has been said about a danseuse, Kuvalayā, that she attained the highest peak of purity when she belonged to a group of actors in one of her earlier lives and performed a Buddhist drama (nāṭaka) in honour of one of the early Buddhas. According to Lalitavistara Buddha himself received training *inter alia* in the art of dramaturgy (nāṭya) too in his youth. The poetry of Māra and Upagupta, that is found in the Divyāvadāna and has been taken from the Sūtrālaṅkāra of Aśvaghoṣa[3], appears almost as a reproduction of some drama.

1. In one of the fragments of a Buddhist drama (see below p. 199, Buddha appears surrounded by brilliant halo (see Lüders, Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen, p. 18). The halo was first taken to India by Greek artists, as Foucher has shown (see above II, 193 A; transl. p. 247, Foot-note). It is also remarkable that the tale of King Udayana with the motif of the "Trojan horse" (see above II, 155; trans. p. 194) has been dramatised by the poet Bhāsa, a predecessor of Kālidāsa. The points of similarity between Bhāṇa and Greek mimologue are many; see M. Lindenau, Festschrift Windisch, p. 41.

2. Cf. Lévi 319 f.; Winternitz, WZKM 27, 1913, 39f.

3. Avadāna 75 (VIII, 5); Lalitavistara XII (ed. Lefmann, p. 156); see Lévi 319. In the Jātakamāla 27, 4 we find an allusion to the sentiment (rasa) that is generated in the heart of the audience by a drama through a good performance.

Aśvaghoṣa, however, is the first Indian poet, who is actually known to us as an author of dramas.

In the year 1911 H. Lüders, among the fragments of palm-leaf manuscripts from Turfan, found pieces of three leaves that are written in the script of Central Asia, and in which he discovered a fragment of a drama of Aśvaghoṣa[1]. Fortunately the end of the drama has come down to us, where at the close of the ninth (last) act the title and the author are mentioned: "Śāriputraprakaraṇa" or the Śāradvatīputraprakaraṇa of the poet Aśvaghoṣa, the son of Suvarṇākṣī. "The available fragments apparently belong to the last two acts of the piece, of which the subject-matter is a dialogue between Śāriputra and his friend Maudgalyāyana, that has been narrated in a sublime manner in Buddhist canons (in the Mahāvagga of the Vinayapiṭaka). The few and small fragments that are available to us unfortunately do not permit us to draw any conclusion with regard to the merit and contents of the drama as well as about its poetical accomplishment. There is only one instance that allows us to surmise that the dramatist Aśvaghoṣa was not inferior in rank to the epic writer. In a dialogue between Śāriputra and the vidūṣaka the latter says : "This lesson does not appear palatable for such Brāhmaṇas as we are.. ". To which Śāriputra promptly replies: "Medicine heals the sick though administered by one of an inferior caste... Does water not bring vigour to the person oppressed by heat, when it has been offered to him by somebody of a low caste?" In any case the available fragments enable us to understand distinctly that here the technique of the drama on the whole is the same as in the classical drama. In case the vidūṣaka, the fool, is wanting at one place, it appears proper there that he is not a companion of a Buddhist saint.

Before the discovery of this drama of Aśvaghoṣa, Lüders had succeeded in assembling, from out of the same fragments of palm-leaf manuscripts, which contained the portion of this drama of Aśvaghoṣa, also fragments of two other dramas. On palaeographical grounds they too must be attributed to

1. See above II, 225; transl. 289, and WZKM 27, 40. f.

2. Das Śāriputraprakaraṇa, ein Drama des Aśvaghoṣa, SBA 1911, 388 ff.

the age of the Kuṣana rule, and therefore, not far away in time from that of the poetry of Aśvaghoṣa[1]. One of these fragments contains a scene of an allegorical drama. Buddhi (intelligence), Dhṛti (patience) and Kīrti (fame) enter and extol the Buddha as "the light, that bears the name man". Kīrti asks— "Where does the Buddha now dwell ?" To this Buddhi replies: "Since his supernatural power is not limited, one should first ask, where does he not live. . . He moves in the air as the bird and. . . sinks into the earth like water, he multiplies his form, causes the sky to shower streams of water and shines like the cloud in the evening glow. . ." The Buddha himself appears surrounded by a brilliant halo. From the available fragments it is not possible to say anything about the subject-matter of the second drama. It is, however, important to the extent that we are able to know from this the characters that appear in the piece. In addition to Buddha, Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, there appear also an ascetic, a Brāhmaṇa, a harlot, and again the vidūṣaka. The last one plays the same rôle as in the classical dramas. He is a lover of dainty dishes and above all the carrier of comic scenes, that are, therefore, not wanting in these dramas, that serve rather as an edifice than as an entertainment.

Although these three dramas are available to us just in fragments, they are of inestimable value inasmuch as they show that in the first century A.D. the technique of drama was fully developed. We have the division into acts, the vidūṣaka, the interchange between prose and verse, the latter composed in metres of classical Sanskrit poetry, and we have also the alteration between Sanskrit and Prākrit. In fact Lüders has shown that the Prākrit dialects used in them represent an older form as compared with the one that is found in classical dramas. From the point of view of language too they prove to be precursors of classical Sanskrit dramas.

Not only the Buddhist dramas in Sanskrit were taken to Central Asia, but there have been found also the fragments

1. H. Lüders, Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen (Königlich Preuszische Turfan-Expeditionen, Kleinere Sanskrittexte), Berlin, 1911; Buddhistische Dramen aus vorklassischer Zeit (Internationale Wochenschrift V, 1911, No. 22.). The hypothesis of Lüders (SBA. 1911, p. 409) that both the dramas were written by Aśvaghoṣa cannot be proved; nevertheless it is not outright improbable.

of Buddhist dramas written in a Central Asian language (Tocharian?)[1].

In classical Sanskrit poetry we do not have any Buddhist drama available to us. Even the drama Nāgānanda of King Harṣadeva cannot be reckoned particularly as Buddhist. The drama Lokānanda of the poet and grammarian Candragomin has come down to us only in its Tibetan translation in the Tanjūr. I-tsing makes a mention of the lyrico-dramatic rendering of the Vessantara-Jātaka in the words: "The Mahāsatta Candra, a learned man of Eastern India, composed a lyric poem on Prince Viśvāntara, till then known as Sudāna, and all men sing and dance it in all the five provinces of India[2]".

In Burma even to-day the Vessentara-Jātaka is presented as a drama on the stage[3] and the consecration of every novice is a type of drama[4]. In China too Buddhist legends are presented as dramas or as an opera in the theatre. In Buddhist monasteries of Tibet we find the relics of ancient popular religious plays, that are parts of the spring and autumn festivals[5].

1. Among the fragments of the Tocharian manuscripts, that have been brought by Pelliot from Douldour—Aqour and Touen-houang, are found also those of two such dramas as have the biography of Buddha as their theme. They show, (according to Lévi, JA 1911, s. 10, t. XVII, 139) influence of Indian dramaturgy and fill some lacunae between Indian and Chinese theatres.

2. Takakasu, I-tsing 164. Lévi (BEEFO 3, 1903, 41f.) presumes that I-tsing by Mahāsattva Candra means Candragomin and this alludes to Lokānanda, although the hero of this drama is not Viśvāntara, but the little known Chinese Maṇicūḍa. The equation of Candragomin with the "Mahāsattva Candra" or Candradāsa, however, has been refuted by B. Liebich, Das Datum Candagomin's und Kalidasa's, Breslau 1903, p. 9 ff., on strong grounds.

3. One such representation has been described by Bhikkhu Ānanda Metteya, Im Schatten von Shwe Dagon, ein buddhistisches Kultur-bild aus Burma, Leipzig, Buddhist Verlag, loc cit, p. 25 ff.

4. The novice represents Prince Siddhārtha and the chief moments of the Buddha-legends are reproduced in the ordination ceremony.

5. Lévi 321 f. The "Tam-bin-shi" ("Blessing of Knowledge") played by the Lamas in Tibet, as described by Hermann Schlagintweit (in his brother Emil Schlagintweit's book, Buddhism in Tibet, Leipzig and London, 1863, p. 232, ff.), in which noble and evil spirit appear before men, seem more as religious mask plays, than as real dramas. The religious play of the Buddhists of Arakan described by R. Spence Hardy (Eastern Monachism, London 1860, p. 236) represents a fight between good and evil spirits (devas and yakas), has, however, little of a real drama. [For similar Chinese performances see Annales du musée Guimet, XII, 416f.]

The Dramas of Bhāsa, Śūdraka and Viśākhadatta

If Aśvaghoṣa, the oldest known dramatist-poet, was a pious Buddhist monk, Bhāsa, the first great poet, whose complete dramas are available to us, was a pious devotee of Viṣṇu and probably a Brāhmaṇa.

Formerly Bhāsa was known just by name as a predecessor of Kālidāsa, who mentions him first of all in the prelude to his drama, the Mālavikāgnimitra, where the actor asks: "How does the assembly show so much of honour to the work of a living author, Kālidāsa, by passing over the poetical works of the widely known poets like Bhāsa, Saumilla, Kaviputra and others ?"[1] It is apparent that Kālidāsa, who in several places of his work, has Bhāsa as the model, has referred to him and perhaps has also imitated him here and there[2]. The poet Bāṇa[3] praises Bhāsa as a poet who had written dramas. Vākpati mentions him in the Gaüḍavaho (verse 800) among his favourite poets. In commentaries of the 9th and 12th centuries is mentioned a drama Svapnanāṭaka or Svapnavāsavadattanāṭaka. Rājaśekhara says (in a verse in the anthology Sūktimuktāvalī) that of all dramas of Bhāsa only the Svapnavāsavadatta proved itself non-combustible in the fire of criticism. And in several anthologies we find a number of stray stanzas that are attributed to Bhāsa[4]. That is all that was known about Bhāsa till 1910.

1. Cf. Lévi 157 ff.; Pischel, GGA 1883, p. 1232f.; Gaṇapati Śāstrī in the introduction to his edition of Svapnavāsavadatta and Pratimānāṭaka; Jacobi, Internat. Monatsschrift VII, 1913, p. 653 ff., A. A. Macdonell, JRAS 1913, p. 186 ff.; V. A. Smith Ind. Ant. 40, 1911, p. 87ff.; Suali, GSAI 25, 1912, p. 5ff., Hertel, Jinakīrti's "Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla, p. 152 ff.; Max Lindenau, Bhāsa-Studien, ein Betrag zur Geschichte des altindischen Dramas, Leipzig 1918. [V. S. Sukthankar in JBRAS 1921-22, pp. 230-249. S. Lévi, JA 1923, p. 19 f.; A. K. and K. R. Pisharoti, BSOS III, p. 107f.; A. K. Pisharoti, Bhāas's Works (Reprinted from the Malayālam journal, Rasikaratna), Trivendrum 1925; K. R. Pisharoti, BSOS III, p. 639, IHQ I, 1925, pp. 103 f.; JBRAS, 1925, p. 246; C. R. Devadhar, ABORI, 1924-25, p. 55 f.; C. Kunhan Raja, Z. f. Ind. und Iran, II, p. 247 f. and Journal of Or. Res. Madras, 1927, p. 232 f.; H. Weller, Festgabe Harmann Jacobi, Bonn 1926, pp. 114-125; Winternitz, Woolner, Com. Vol. 1940, p. 297 f.; A. D. Pusalkar, Bhāsa, a Study, Lahore... 1940, etc. —S. K. De, HSL, 102].

2. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, Svapnavāsavadatta, Introd. p. XXXVII f. and Pratimānāṭaka, Introd. p. III ff.

3. Harṣacarita, Introductory verse 15.

4. Verses of Bhāsa have been collected in anthologies and translated into German by Aufrecht, Ind. Stud. 17, 168 ff.; ZDMG 27, 65; 36,

A.D. In the year 1910 an Indian scholar T. Gaṇpati Śāstrī found in course of a tour undertaken for collection of Sanskrit manuscripts in South Travancore a palm-leaf manuscript, that contained ten dramas and fragments of an eleventh one, that he rightly called as the best dramas of Bhāsa. Subsequently two more dramas were found that showed the same characteristics as the ten dramas that were first found and could also be included among the writings of Bhāsa[1].

All these dramas have certain special peculiarities, on account of which they are distinguished from all the hitherto known classical pieces. All the other dramas begin with the nāndī, that is followed by the stage-direction: "after the nāndī is over the sūtradhāra (enters)", and then the prelude begins with the talk of the sūtradhāra. All the recently discovered dramas begin with the words: "after the nāndī is over, the sūtradhāra enters", and then he utters the introductory benedictory prayer to Viṣṇu[2] in which the names of the main characters of the play are usually mentioned in a significant manner. In classical dramas, in the prelude, something is said in praise of the work that is being presented and the name of its author is mentioned in very high terms. That is not the case in the recently discovered dramas. The prelude is always very short and abruptly leads to the beginning of the first act.[3]

370f., and Peterson, Subh. 80 ff.; JRAS 1891, 331 f., see also above p. 117, 177.

1. That the 13 anonymous dramas that have been found should be attributed to Bhāsa has been opposed by Bhaṭṭanātha Svāmin (Ind. Ant. 45, 1916, 189ff.) and L. D. Barnett (BSOS, I, 3, 1920, p. 35 ff.). Both of them have advanced noteworthy arguments, and in the opinion of W. they have shot at the target. A. Banerji-Śāstrī, JRAS 1921, p. 367 ff. has defended the authorship of Bhāsa, which has been refuted by Barnett, ibid p. 587 ff. The linguistic and metrical researches of V. S. Sukthankar, Studies in Bhāsa, JAOS 40, 1920, 248 ff.; 41, 1921, 1 ff. and of Wilhelm Printz, Bhāsa's Prākrit, Frankfurt a. M. 1921 (published by the author) establish the hypothesis that all the pieces have one and the same author, and that it is strongly probable that he was older than Kālidāsa. Consequently they have strengthened the amount of probability of the hypothesis, that the dramas are of Bhāsa. Winternitz has attempted to show in an essay "Der indische Dramendichter Bhāsa" (Ostasiat. Zeitschrift IX, 1922, p. 282 ff.) what can be said in favour of this hypothesis. notwithstanding certain opinions that are against it and cannot be brushed aside. See also Konow, Ind. Ant. 49, 1920, 1233 f., F. W. Thomas, JRAS 1922 ff.

2. This benedictory utterance would not, therefore, be called "nāndī", see above, p. 182 f.

3. At the end of the prelude in the classical dramas, it is mentioned

As the pieces begin with a benedictory stanza, they end as well with it. This "concluding sentence of the actor" (bharatavākya) is very much different in other dramas: but in the recently discovered ones, in many cases, it is expressed in the same words, however, in all cases the meaning at least remains the same: "may the lion-strong king (*rājasiṁha*) rule over the whole of this earth (or our country)". Moreover, these dramas show all sorts of uniformity in respect of syntax and idiom. In none of them, as is the case in other works, the title and the name of the author are mentioned at the end. And on the basis of the said characteristic similarities found in these dramas, their discoverer was able to conclude that all of them belonged to a single author. Since among these dramas was found also Svapnavāsavadatta, that is attributed to Bhāsa by Rājaśekhara, it was concluded that the writer of all these dramas was Bhāsa. His statement finds support in the circumstance that all of them exhibit the same antiquarian stamp. They are distinguished from classical dramas also on account of their decidedly smaller extension. And lastly all of them are remarkable and partly contain first rate poetry that *prima facie* make the hypothesis that they had been written by a great poet probable. Since now among the predecessors of Kālidāsa there is no name that is so famous as that of Bhāsa, this lends support to the view that we have here the dramas of Bhāsa. It is to be always kept in mind that whenever in the following pages we speak about the recently discovered dramas of Bhāsa this has to be taken with certain reservation[1].

It is not possible to determine with certainty the age of Bhāsa, and his place too is unknown. From his dramas all that we are able to deduce with some certainty is that in case he was not a Brāhmaṇa, which probably he was, he was at any rate a strict follower of Brāhmaṇical religion and practices and credulous devotee of Viṣṇu. He delights in mentioning in his dramas Brāhmaṇical rites and customs and always stresses upon the supreme status of the

as prastāvanā, in the recently discovered pieces it is named as sthāpanā. Only in the Karṇabhāra it is called prastāvanā.

[1. Winternitz is reported to have later expressed the opinion that he was no longer a believer in Bhāsa's authorship of the plays. (C. R. Devadhar, pref. to his ed., Poona 1937, referred to by S. K. De, HSL, p. 102.]

Brāhmaṇas. It will suffice here to quote a few sentences from him for the purpose of proving it; viz.... *sarvatra sadā ca nāma dvijottamāḥ pūjyatamāḥ pṛthivyām*, "Everywhere and every moment are the Brāhmaṇas worthy of the highest honour on the earth"; *viprotsaṅge vittamāvarjya sarvaṁ rājñā deyaṁ cāpamātraṁ sutebhyaḥ*, "The king should hand over to the Brāhmaṇas the entire wealth of his kingdom and leave only his bow for his sons[1]". Furthermore the poet's staunch faith in Viṣṇu becomes evident here and there in his dramas. Kṛṣṇa is the highest god in particular. In the Dūtavākya and the Bālacarita each line breathes the feeling of absolute surrender to the devotion of Viṣṇu. He is familiar with the complete Kṛṣṇa-legend. In case it be probable that the cowherd god Kṛṣṇa became identical with Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa in about the period of the birth of Christ and that this cult was propagated by the Ābhīras in the first century A.D.[2], it will go to prove that Bhāsa could not, as Gaṇapati has tried to show, have lived before Christ. The Ābhīras attained political influence first in the second and third centuries A.D. In any case it is remarkable that neither the cowherd god Kṛṣṇa nor Rāma is mentioned as an incarnation of Viṣṇu in any inscription written before the Christian era,[3] whilst Bhāsa's treatment of the Kṛṣṇa-legend as well as his notion about Rāma in the Abhiṣekanāṭaka presupposes peak development of the cult of Viṣṇu as in his faith in Kṛṣna- and Rāma-incarnations. That Bhāsa could not be of so early an age follows also from the fact that he knew the Mahābhārata almost exactly in the form in which we have it today and he has mentioned literary works of which pre-Christian origin is doubtful. Thus in the Pratimānāṭaka (act V) he mentions one Mānavīya Dharmaśāstra, a Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra, a Nyāyaśāstra of Medhātithi and a Prācetasa-Śrāddhakalpa. The Yogaśāstra is referred to here and in the Avimāraka, the Arthaśāstra, in the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. Lastly in the matter of language and style too Bhāsa stands closer to Kālidāsa than to Aśvaghoṣa. That the latter is older is proved also by the fact that his Prākrit

1. Madhyamavyāyoga 9; Pañcarātra 1, 6 and 22.
2. Bhandarkar, Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism etc. p. 37 f.
3. Bhandarkar, ibid, pp. 35 f., 46.

represents an earlier stage of development than that of the classical dramas, although the Prākrit of Bhāsa deviates little from that of Kālidāsa[1]. In case, therefore, we can with some certainty fix the date of Aśvaghoṣa probably in the 2nd century A. D., Bhāsa can be placed not before the end of the 3rd century or the first-half of the 4th century A.D. He could have hardly lived more than 100 years before Kālidāsa[2].

Upto the present time thirteen dramas of Bhāsa—as in any case, we are in a position to state with a high degree of probability—have come to be known. The Pañcarātra derives its plot from the Mahābhārata and so do the one-act plays Dūtavākya, Madhyamavyāyoga, Dūtaghaṭotkaca, Karṇabhāra and Ūrubhaṅga, that perhaps are the earliest works of the author. The Bālacarita treats the story of Kṛṣṇa, and both the Pratimānāṭaka and the Abhiṣekanāṭaka narrate Rāma-legends. The themes of the Svapnavāsavadatta and the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa have been retold from the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya[3] and probably the plots of the dramas Avimāraka and Daridracārudatta have been taken from the same source[4].

The comparative simplicity of style, several ingenuities in shortening of the plot and occasional linguistic unevenness as well go to show that the dramas, of which the plots have been taken from the Mahābhārata, belong to the first works of the poet. Further they go to show that he was a born-dramatist. Notwithstanding the facts that the plots have been taken from

1. Cf. V. Lesny, ZDMG 72, 1917, 203 ff.

2. Lindenau, ibid, p. 14f. believes that Bhāsa in the matter of the technique of drama stands closer to Aśvaghoṣa than to Kālidāsa. He puts Bhāsa in about 200 A.D. and Aśvaghoṣa and Bharata between 100 and 200 A.D. They are, however, mere vague conjectures, since proof is wanting. [Keith, SD, p. 95 remarks.., "these matters do not permit of precise envaluation of time, and, if we place Bhāsa about A.D. 300, we go as far as the evidence allows. Sten Konow, Ind. Drama, p. 51 would assign the author of the plays to the reign of Kṣatrapa Rudrasiṁha I, i.e. 2nd century A. D. Barnett conjectures that rājasiṁha is a proper name and refers to Pāṇḍya Tēr Māran Rājasiṁha I (c. 675 A.D.).—S. K. De HSL, p. 106.].

3. It has been wrongly questioned by Hertel, Jinakīrtis "Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla", p. 152 ff. See also Lacôte, JA, s. 11, t. XIII, 1919, 493 ff.

4. The dramas have been edited by their discoverer Gaṇapati Śāstrī in the TSS. A drama Kiraṇāvalī, a nāṭikā, of the type of the Ratnāvalī, should, according to Krisnamacharya, p. 67, be attributed to Bhāsa, notwithstanding the fact that the existence of this drama has been doubted by Bhaṭṭanātha Svāmin (Ind. Ant. 41, 1912, 141).

the epic and that these pieces on account of preponderance of verse over prose remind us further of their epical origin, in all these small dramas the poet has succeeded in making them extraordinarily dramatic.

The Pañcarātra[1] is a drama in three acts which closely follows the fourth book of the Mahābhārata. The poet had known the Virāṭaparvan exactly in the same form as we know it to-day, but he had freely modified the plot.

> In the beginning of the first act, with great vividness, a forest-fire that breaks out on account of carelessness of a priest-boy in a sacrifice of Duryodhana, has been described. At the end of the sacrifice Duryodhana asks in a highly courteous manner Brāhmaṇa Droṇa, his teacher in archery, as to what does he ask for as his remuneration for the sacrifice. Droṇa hasitates to answer. But when Duryodhana, by hurling holy water on the ground, promises to fulfil his desire he says that he wants no sacrificial fee other than that the Pāṇḍavas be given half of the kingdom. After consultation with Śakuni and Karṇa, Duryodhana agrees to do it, on the condition that in case within five days[2] a news is received from the Pāṇḍavas, he will surrender to them half of his empire. Whilst Droṇa is very much depressed at this condition, because nobody has heard anything about the exiled Pāṇḍavas during the period of twelve years, there comes a messenger who reports that Virāṭa will not appear for the honour of the princes on account of the grief that he is undergoing due to the killing of the hundred Kīcakas. Bhīṣma suspects that Bhīma must be behind it and advises Droṇa to agree to the proposed condition. Thereafter Bhīṣma instigates Duryodhana to arrange for a raid into the cow-pen of King Virāṭa. This raid into the cow-pen forms the theme of the second act that is played inside the palace of Virāṭa. Uttara, the son of Virāṭa, enters into the fight against Duryodhana and wins it, bacause Arjuna, in the garb of a eunuch Bṛhan-

1. Published in TSS Nr. 17, 1912; with a Sanskrit commentary [of Kṛṣṇācārya Śāstrī and an English translation by W. G. Urdhawareshe, Indore 1920.]

2. Hence the title: The drama of the event in the five days.

nalā drives his chariot. The news of the battle is brought to the audience by a herald, who returns back and brings another report. Bhīma pulls Abhimanyu from the chariot and takes him a prisoner. At the end of the act the Pāṇḍavas disclose their identity. Arjuna takes Uttarā as the bride for his son. The third act takes us into the court of Duryodhana. A servant brings the news of capture of Abhimanyu. With the help of an arrow, of which the shaft is named "*arjuna*", the actual position becomes known. Thus within the period of five days comes the news about the Pāṇḍavas and Duryodhana is obliged to surrender to them half of his empire. The double rôle, in which the disguised Pāṇḍavas appear in the court of Virāṭa, is employed to bring in much of activity in the drama. The proper device of the poet *inter alia* is the imprisonment of Abhimanyu by Bhīma[1], that introduces a dramatic scene between the father and the son.

The poet has evidently utilized the episode of the demon Baka and the Brāhmaṇa family of the Mahābhārata[2] for construction of the theme of the one-act play Madhyama-vyāyoga[3]. It is indeed wholly naive and fashioned with a dramatic skill. The one-act Dūtavākya, "The Message" is an outright free dramatisation of the episode of Kṛṣṇa's presenting himself as an envoy of the Pāṇḍavas and is narrated in the Mahābhārata[4].

Kṛṣṇa appears in the council-hall of Duryodhana as the envoy of the Pāṇḍavas. With the intention of annoying Kṛṣṇa, Duryodhana gets brought a piece of painting, in which the scene of dragging by hair into the hall of half-naked Draupadī has been presented. We get an accurate

1. In W. Bhīṣma.

2. Mahābh. 1, 157 ff.; see above I, 279, transl. p. 333.

3. This and the four following one-act plays have been edited in the TSS No. 22, 1912. The theme is based on the event that Bhīma is referred to as "the middle" (*madhyama*) among the five sons of Pāṇḍu. Emphasis is laid on this nomenclature also in the Pañcarātra (p. 40), a thing that goes to prove that both the pieces were written by one and the same author. [This play has been translated by E. P. Janvier, Mysore, 1921, and P. E. Pavolini, GSAI, XXIX, 1 f.] On the vyāyoga, see above p. 186.

4. Mahābh. 5, 91, 94 f., 1 124-131.

description of the picture in the speech of Duryodhana[1]. Kṛṣṇa, however, appears here as a human envoy and as Supreme God at the same time. Hence he is neither terrified, nor are they able to arrest him. He assumes the form of All-Pervasive (Viśvarūpa) and is soon tall, soon small, soon he multiplies himself, so much so that the entire hall becomes full of Kṛṣṇas[2]. In anger he calls for a mighty demon, who hands over to him his terrible weapons. All these appear on the scene in personification; lastly also Bird Garuḍa, the conveyance of Viṣṇu, comes in. At the end, however, his anger gets pacified and the old blind king Dhṛtarāṣṭra thoroughly appeases the Supreme God with his submissive prayer.

Like this piece, Dūtaghaṭotkaca, "(The Drama of) Ghaṭotkaca as messenger", a considerably dull one-act play, mainly serves towards glorification of Kṛṣṇa. The very incomplete theme has been invented by the poet, since the Mahābhārata does not know about the ambassadorship of Ghaṭotkaca, with which the rest of the drama has nothing to do except the tragic death of the boy Abhimanyu. The Karṇabhāra, "(The Drama of) Load of Karṇa"[3], is a dramatisation of the tale of the Mahābhārata (1, 111), where Indra appears in the guise of a Brāhmaṇa-beggar and asks for his coat of mail and ear-ring. Among these one-act plays, the most significant is the Ūrubhaṅga, "The (Drama of) Fracture of the Thigh", a poetic creation that is worthy of the fame of Bhāsa. Not only is the language of higher style and beauty, but the dramatisation of the plot[4] too has been executed with a superior skill.

In the beginning of the drama three heralds, of whom each alternately recites a verse, describe the battle-field and the fighting with a mace, that has taken place between Duryodhana and Bhīma in the really difficult

1. The passage is important for the criticism of the Mahābh. II, 67 f.; see Winternitz, Festschrift Kuhn, p. 299 ff.

2. We can hardly understand how all this and also the subsequent appearance of the weapons and of Garuḍa could be represented on the stage. That probably is left to the imagination of the audience.

3. Perhaps "Karṇa's Coat of Mail"; so according to Lindenau, Ibid, p. 8.

4. Mahābh. 9, 58.

kāvya-style. So probably in verses, as in prose, the poet, whose language is elsewhere so simple, proves him-self a master of the kāvya-style. Thus in stanza 6 he compares a battle with a frightful sacrifice, in which the trunks of elephants are represented as the poles of a sacrifice (yūpa), the arrows, as the holy grass, the stratified bodies of killed elephants form the altar, in which the fire of the enemy is enflamed, the battle-cry is the sacred muttering of sacrificial formulae, and the men who have fallen down are the beasts of sacrifice. Against all rules of Indian dramaturgy Duryodhana, with his broken ribs, appears in person on the scene. Unusual is the scene where the boy Durjaya searches for his father in the battle-field; touching is the meeting of the dying wounded king with his hoary old blind father and his worthy mother Gāndhārī, in which the only request he makes is that in his next birth too may she become his mother. Of all the Indian dramas, this small piece alone reminds us of the Greek tragedy, and in fact it ends tragically with the words that Duryodhana "enters into the heaven".

The Bālacarita, "The Adventure of Boy (Kṛṣṇa)"[1], is the oldest of the available dramas that have the Kṛṣṇa-legend as their theme. In this work too Bhāsa extracts in a historical manner the dramatic elements from the famous legends and has freely introduced many things for the purpose of dramatic action.

Here the poet presents the wonderful activities of the divine hero partly in a realistic manner on the stage and partly he narrates them in a lively and not altogether devised brief report. As in the Dūtavākya, here too the weapons of the God Viṣṇu and his conveyance Garuḍa appear on the stage as dramatic characters. The beginning of the second act is a thrilling scene, invented by the poet. Horrible fantoms appear before Kaṁsa in his bed-chamber; the curse of the ṛṣi appears as a Caṇḍāla,

1. Edited in TSS, No. 21, 1912, Cf. V. Lesný, Bhāsovo Bālacaritam (Listy filologické 42, 1915, 437 ff.); Winternitz, ZDMG 74, 1920, 125 ff.; Lindenau, ibid, p. 22 ff. An edition and German translation (Die Abenteuer des Knaben Krischna) of the Bālacarita by H. Weller had been published in 1922 at Leipzig.

and among his retinue appear the young Caṇḍāla-girls dressed in black, who rush upon him and want him to rejoice with them. Against all rules of dramaturgy the fight of the bull-demon Ariṣṭa is presented on the stage in act III and that ends in the destruction of the demon in act IV. Likewise the defeat of the snake-demon Kāliya in act IV takes place at least partly on the stage. And in the fifth act not only the pugilist Cāṇūra and Muṣṭika, but also Kaṁsa himself is dashed on the ground with the word:

kaṁsāsuraṁ ca yamalokamahaṁ nayāmi ।

"And also the demon Kaṁsa, I send
Forth into the world of Yama."

Kṛṣṇa mounts the terrace, pulls Kaṁsa by his head, and slays him on the ground:

eṣa eṣa durātmā kaṁsaḥ—
vistīrṇalohitamukhaḥ parivṛttanetro
bhagnāṁśukaṇṭhakaṭijānukarorujaṅghaḥ ।
vicchinnahārapatitāṅgadalambasūtro
vajraprabhagnaśikharaḥ patito yathādriḥ ॥

"Here lies he, the devil Kaṁsa—
With his face besmeared with blood; eyes oozing out,
Shoulders, neck, hips, thighs, hands and knees broken,
The chain of the neck broken and the bracelets fallen down,
The belt hanging—is dying, like a hill that has tumbled with the stroke of thunder."

In the whole drama, Bhāsa appears as a devout worshipper of Kṛṣṇa. He does not allow a single moment for his audience to think that the hero is not only a god, but the Supreme Divine Being, Nārāyaṇa—Viṣṇu.

Both in the Pratimānāṭaka and in the Abhiṣekanāṭaka Bhāsa has dealt with the story of Rāma. The Pratimānāṭaka, "The Drama of the Picture"[1] reproduces in its seven acts the contents of the main story of the Rāmāyaṇa, Books II and III in a very independent manner. In the first three and fifth acts the poet has especially retold the story with a free device.

1. Published in TSS No. 42, 1915.

In act I we see how Sītā puts on just for fun the bark-garment, accidently brought (from the theatre cloak-room) by one of her maid-servants with a view to see how it fits her. Then comes the news that the coronation of Rāma is to take place[1] and at the same time is delivered the message that the coronation ceremony has been postponed and that Rāma is to go to live in a forest for 14 years. The action develops (as is usual in Bhāsa) with extraordinary speed. In the bark-garment, worn for the sake of fun, Sītā and likewise the faithful brother Lakṣmaṇa follow Rāma into the forest. In act II the bewailings of King Daśaratha and his death are represented in a captivating manner. He appears half-mad on the stage, speaks incoherently and lastly succumbs to the power of Death. He breathes his last after he has invoked his ancestors, whom he believes to be seeing. The chamberlain spreads a curtain over the dead body. With heart-rending bewailings of the audience the act ends—that stands in sharp contrast to ordinary rules of dramaturgy. In act III the scene is laid in the picture-palace of his ancestors, in which the statue of the deceased king Daśaratha is also installed[2]. It has been erected for the visit of the queens when Bharata, free from any presentiment, returns by chariot to Ayodhyā from the house of his maternal uncle. While he is in repose, that he takes in front of the temple, for the first time he comes to know about the misfortune in a talk with a temple-priest. Just after he has fallen into swoon the queens come with Sumantra. Bharata regains his consciousness and greets respectfully Kauśalyā and Sumitrā and reproaches Kaikeyī.

---

1. Even the preparation made in the concert-hall (saṁgītaśālā, p. 4) for staging of a suitable drama is a part of the ceremony of ordination of the king.

2. The scene of the picture-palace of ancestors is an innovation of Bhāsa, that he wants to indicate also by the title of the drama. It is remarkable that in Indian literature we find a mention of a custom like installation of pictures of ancestors in a temple. The custom seems to be unknown even to Bharata. Pṛthvīpāla, minister of Jayasiṁha and Kumārapāla, got erected "a maṇḍapa with columns and a self-opening hall, in which the statues of seven of his ancestors were presented in the picture of mounting elephants in the temple, got built by Vimala on the mountain Arbuda in the year 1032; See H. J a c o b i, Sanatkumāracaritam (ABayA XXXI, 2, 1921) p. XI f.

He refuses to be coronated as king and decides to go to Rāma. The journey to the forest-hermitage of Rāma constitutes the subject-matter of act IV. Original is the abduction of Sītā in act V. Here we find both Rāma and Sītā in a grove in which the latter waters one of her favourite plants. Rāma is aggrieved because he has to perform the śrāddha on the day of anniversary of his father's death and is not in a position to offer suitable gifts to the people. Then comes the demon Rāvaṇa in the guise of a mendicant, who is respectfully received and honoured as a guest by Rāma and Sītā. Rāvaṇa says that he has studied the Vedas and the Śāstras, particularly the Śrāddhakalpa, the manual of offerings to the manes. Rāma takes a note of this and seeks his advice as to how he can pay homage to his deceased fore-fathers in the best manner. Rāvaṇa describes the gifts with which one should try to pay respects to his fathers and then says that there lives in the Himālaya a type of antelope with which the manes can be got satisfied fully. Whilst they are thus conversing Rāma sees an antelope that is exactly like this—and is running in his front. It is an illusion created through witchcraft by Rāvaṇa. Rāma hastens after it and leaves Sītā all alone. Rāvaṇa takes advantage of this circumstance and carries away Sītā crying for help. The rest of the plot deviates little from the famous story.

In the Abhiṣekanāṭaka, "The Drama of Coronation (of Rāma)"[1] in six acts, is presented what is just passingly hinted at in act VII of the Pratimānāṭaka. In the Abhiṣekanāṭaka the contents of books IV-VI of the Rāmāyaṇa have briefly been put together. Whilst in the Pratimānāṭaka Rāma is a human hero, in the Abhiṣekanāṭaka, particularly in acts IV and VI, he is revered as the sole Lord Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa, and in act VII Agni declares that Sītā is an incarnation of Goddess Lakṣmī.

The act I, in which Vālin, the monkey-king, expries on the stage, is in itself a short tragedy. In many of the details Bhāsa deviates from the epic. Thus in act IV a

1. Published in TSS No. 26, 1913. [Trans. E. Beccarini-Crescenzi, GSAI, XXVII, 1ff.]. Many of the verbal correspondences go to prove that the two Rāma-dramas had one and the same author.

bridge, extending upto Laṅkā, is not constructed on the ocean but the gcd Varuṇa gets frightened at the threat of Rāma. He appears fully perturbed, prays Rāma, as Nārāyaṇa, who has become a man, "the ultimate cause of the three worlds", requests him to pardon his fault and offers him free passage by which the ocean gets divided into two to enable his army to go across it. Rāma walks over it and in a moment he is present in Laṅkā. He casts his prolonged glance at the island that has been discarded by fortune and will shortly be destroyed with his arrows:—

udadhijalagateva naurvipannā
nipatati rāvaṇakarṇadhāradoṣāt ॥

"Like a forlorn ship, that has sunk
Into the ocean, sinks down (the city of Laṅkā),
On account of the fault of Rāvaṇa, the helmsman."

A fitting deviation from the epic occurs in act V, where the episodes of the Rāmāyaṇa VI, 31 and VI, 92 are joined together: Rāvaṇa downright shows Sītā the heads, detached from the bodies, appearing to be those of the heroes Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa, killed by Indrajit—in fact, it is a delusion caused through witchcraft—then comes a messenger, who brings the news that his son Indrajit has been killed by Rāma. It has really a greater dramatic consequence. Bhāsa has not at all worked towards easy dramatisation, but has indeed fashioned a real drama out of the epic. The language is clear and simple. Yet beautiful pictures are not wanting here. Thus Lakṣmaṇa shouts at the sight of the ocean (VI, 3): "Here, here is the Lord Varuṇa" -

sajalajaladharendranīlanīro
vilulitaphenataraṅgacāruhāraḥ ।
samadhigatanadīsahasrabāhur
haririva bhāti saritpatiḥ śayānaḥ ॥

"Like Hari, appears the river-lord lying stretched,
With his one thousand arms of river extended;
He shines forth, his saphire-blue water looking like the cloud, full of water,
Wearing the beautiful garland of waves with foams scattered about,"

Again in the concluding stanza of act IV there is a splendid description of the sun-set :

astādrimastakagataḥ pratisaṁhṛtāṁśuḥ
sandhyānurañjitavapuḥ pratibhāti sūryaḥ ।
raktojjvalāṁśukavṛte dviradasya kumbhe
jāmbūnadena racitaḥ pulako yathaiva ॥

"The sun has reached the top of the setting hill;
He has collected his rays;
He looks brilliant with his body coloured by the evening
And appears like a jewel placed together with gold
On an elephant's temple, covered with a shining red piece of cloth."

Quite different from all these dramas, based on epics, in which there is neither a vidūṣaka nor a comic scene, in which verses are strongly dominent and Prākrit is wholly left behind Sanskrit, are the prakaraṇas of Bhāsa[1]. The most important of these and undoubtedly the master work of the poet is the Svapnavāsavadatta[1], "(The Drama of) Vāsavadattā (who meets her husband) in a Dream". The subject-matter of the piece, of which the plot has probably been taken from the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya, is as follows:—

The soothsayers have predicted that for the good of King Udayana and his kingdom it is necessary that he marries Padmāvatī, a sister of the king of Magadha. But the king loves his wife Vāsavadattā so cordially that he can never even think of taking a second wife. This touches very much his clever and faithful minister Yaugandharāyaṇa. He gets the city set into flames and the rumour is spread that he, along with Vāsavadattā, whom he has been trying to save, has been burnt. Then dressed as an ascetic he travels with Vāsavadattā, whom he declares to be his sister, upto Magadha, where he leaves his pretended sister in the care of Princess Padmāvatī. The two ladies at once contract friendship. In act II we see them together playing ball. From their conversation we learn

1. Published in TSS No. 15, 1912, Translated into German by H. Jacobi in Internat. Monatsschrift VII, 1913, p. 653 ff. 'and into French by A. Baston, Paris 1914 (Bibl. or Elzévirienne No. 87) with a foreword by S. Lévi. An English translation by G. Sherriff and Panna Lall was published at Allahabad in 1918 (according to Ind. Ant. 48, 176).

that Padmāvatī has a mind to marry King Udayana. Soon the nurse of Padmāvatī reports that Udayana has agreed to accept the latter as his wife. The soliloquy of Vāsavadattā shows how greatly she gets perturbed at this. But she has, however, the satisfaction, as she concludes from the words of the nurse, that her husband wants to have a second spouse only out of sense of duty and not account of lack of affection for her. In acts III and IV the marriage of Udayana and Padmāvatī is solemnised. Vāsavadattā is very much pained, as she has to string a garland for the bride of her own highly beloved husband. In act IV there is an interlude in which the vidūṣaka enters and expresses his satisfaction that the marriage has taken place early in which he has enjoyed dainty dishes. But he complains that his stomach has gone out of order. Then Padmāvatī enters with Vāsavadattā. From their conversation we learn that King Udayana still loves Vāsavadattā, supposed to be dead, and always thinks about her. Then the king and the vidūṣaka enter into conversation that the two ladies overhear. The vidūṣaka asks the king as to who is dearer to him, whether Vāsavadattā or Padmāvatī. The king evades the answer for a long time, but at last admits that although Padmāvatī is loved by him, still his heart always hangs about Vāsavadattā, who is dead. Then the king asks the vidūṣaka whether he likes both of them. He, however, decides in favour of Padmāvatī, because she offers him dainty dishes and takes more care of him. In joke, however, the king again thinks about Vāsavadattā, and his sorrow again becomes fresh and he begins to weep. When the vidūṣaka goes to fetch water for the king to wash his eyes and the two ladies are deeply touched by the conversation overheard by them, Vāsavadattā goes into retreat and Padmāvatī approaches her husband. Now the vidūṣaka brings water for the king to wash his eyes and the king in order that Padmāvatī may not feel hurt says that flower-pollens have fallen into his eyes.

Act V is played in the bathing chamber of the palace. The maid-servants report that Padmāvatī has got headache and that she is resting on a bed in the bathing

apartment. The vidūṣaka reports this to the king, and both of them enter into the bathing chamber. The vidūṣaka gets frightened and hurries backward. He thinks to have seen a cobra, but in fact, it is a garland of flowers that is lying on the earth, and he is ridiculed by the king[1]. They go into it, but Padmāvatī is not there. Here the king lies on the bed and asks the vidūṣaka to tell him a story. He begins his story in a stupid manner and the king sleeps in the meantime. The vidūṣaka goes away, and Vāsavadattā comes in to see Padmāvatī, who is not feeling well. She sits on the bed, believing Padmāvatī to be sleeping there. But when in dream the king utters "O Vāsavadattā", she comes to know that it is the king. He dreams, and in the dream he speaks with Vāsavadattā. She stays there a little, while he is dreaming and replies to his questions, but she retreats back before the king rises up. Hardly she is out when the king awakes from his slumber and shouts:—

vāsavadatte, tiṣṭha tiṣṭha hā dhik[1],
niṣkrāman saṁbhrameṇāhaṁ
dvārapakṣeṇa tāḍitaḥ ।
tato vyaktaṁ na jānāmi
bhūtārthoyaṁ manorathaḥ ॥

"Vasāvadattā, please stay ! ah !
While I was going out in haste,
I struck against a wing of the door,
Thence I know not clearly,
If this is true or it is
Just my wistful thinking".

(Vidūṣaka enters)

Vidūṣaka: Are you awoke ?

King: Friend, I have a fresh news: Vasavādattā is alive !

Vidūṣaka:—Ah, where is Vāsavadattā ? Vāsavadattā died long ago !

King:—Friend, do not say this !

śayyāyāmavasuptaṁ māṁ bodhayitvā sakhe gatā ।

1. In Indian dramas it is one of the typical peculiarities of the vidūṣaka that he gets terrified.

dagdheti bruvatā pūrvaṁ vañcitosmi rumaṇvatā ||

"When I was asleep, she aroused me up and went away,
I have been deceived by Rumaṇvān, who formerly
had reported that she was burnt."

Vidūṣaka: Ah, that is quite unthinkable ! Since I made a mention of the bathing place in Avantī, you thought about Vāsavadattā and you have seen her in dream.

King:—

yadi tāvadayaṁ svapno dhanyamapratibodhanam ||
athāyaṁ vibhramo vā syāt vibhramo hyastu me ciram ||

"In case, it be merely a dream,
Blessing it would be, if I had not awoke;
In case it be an illusion,
Let this illusion continue for ever."

While the vidūṣaka is trying to convince him that he has just dreamt, the chamberlain appears and brings in the report of break of war; this induces the king to hurry forth to war.

Act VI takes us into the palace of King Udayana. The king finds a lute that at one time belonged to Vāsavadattā when he was training her in playing on lute. At the sight of this lute the painful recollection wakes up in the king:

śrutisukhaninade kathaṁ nu devyāḥ
stanayugale jaghanasthale ca suptā |
vihagagaṇarajovikīrṇadaṇḍā
pratibhayamadhyuṣitāsyaraṇyavāsam ||

api ca, asnigdhāsi ghoṣavati yā tapasvinyā na smarasi |

śroṇīsamudvahanapārśvanipīḍitāni
khedastanāntarasukhānyupagūhitāni |
uddiśya māṁ ca virahe paridevitāni
vādyāntareṣu kathitāni ca sasmitāni ||

"Beloved lute, once hast thou rested
Over her breasts and on her thighs ;
How hast thou led the terrible life in the forest,
Where birds have scattered thy stick in dust."

"Besides, thou art devoid of sentiment,
O Ghoṣavatī, that thou remembereth not about her—

Carrying thee between her thighs, pressing thee between her arms,
Offering thee the pleasant embrace between her warm breasts;
Bewailing in her separation from me,
And the conversation full of smiles,
That took place in between musical pauses."

The amorous bewailing of the king is interrupted by the arrival of messengers from the parents of Vāsavadattā. They bring to Udayana, in the name of the queen (the mother of Vāsavadattā), a beautiful picture in which the king is shown with Vāsavadattā[1]. In the meantime Yaugandharāyaṇa comes to claim back her pretended sister. With the help of the painting the identity of Vāsavadattā gets disclosed and the facts come to be known. The beautiful picture leads to the concluding verse of the actor (bharatavākya):—

imāṁ sāgaraparyantāṁ himvadvindhyakuṇḍalām ।
mahīmekātapatrāṅkāṁ rājasiṁhaḥ praśāstu naḥ ॥

"May our lion-king protect the whole of this earth, that extends up to the sea, on whose face the Himālaya and the Vindhya appear like two giant ear-rings[2]."

If we compare the story as found in Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara[3] with that in Bhāsa's drama we cannot but admire the latter. It is true that we do know how Bhāsa found the story in Guṇāḍhya. In case Somadeva reproduces accurately, just half-way, the story of the Bṛhatkathā and has not

1. The picture was produced to ratify in it the sacramental marriage of Udayana and Vāsavadattā that could not be performed actually on account of the flight of Udayana. It is a thing that is alluded to also at the end of the drama Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. In the Kathāsaritsāgara 1, 14 there is no mention of the picture, but we find the actual marriage taking place instead.

2. The transl. given by W. is from Jacobi.

3. Book III, Kap. 15 and 16. F. Lacôte (JA p. 11, t. XIII, 1919, p. 493ff.), attempts, on the basis of similarity of the story in the Kathāsaritsāgara and the allusions in the Bṛhatkathāślokasaṁgraha with Bhāsa's Svapnavāsavadatta and with the fable of Tāpasavatsarājacarita of Mātrarāja, to reconstruct the form of the story of the Bṛhatkathā, which had served as the model for the drama of Bhāsa.

perhaps, that can hardly be assumed, grossly worsened it, this work is worthy of the greatest admiration on account of the delicacy and fineness with which Bhāsa has eliminated all that is clumsy and rude in the story. In Somadeva how vulgar it is, when King Udayana is almost aware of the truth and apparently rests quite, because wise Nārada has predicted that he will have a son from Vāsavadattā; so he should simply remain firm, in case he himself is not to die immediately; but on the other hand his rash decision to marry Padmāvatī appears as a little motivated and crude; and vulgar is the whole of the conclusion in the Kathāsaritsāgara. Reversely in Bhāsa's drama the simplification effected with the help of the dream, that is certainly a creation of the poet, is fine and delicate. Without doubt it is the well-merited pride for this innovation that induced the poet to insert the word "dream" (*svapna*) in the title of his drama. The dream prepares the way for the disclosure that wholly follows as a sequence from the picture. Because in the drama the king is not aware of the actual situation. All the remaining scenes are well grounded. The relationship between the two ladies, Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī, both of whom are generous in spirit and tender at heart and love with fidelity one and the same husband, can, however, be fully realised only from the Indian point of view. The westerners cannot but sympathise with Vāsavadattā in her grief when she, with another girl, has to make preparations for her husband's marriage-celebration and she is obliged to decorate the bride herself, and with Padmāvatī when she perceives with painful resignation that Vāsavadattā is loved by the husband the more. In case, we possessed only this single drama of Bhāsa, we would have been obliged to consider him as one of the greatest poets, on account of its poetic beauties. But notwithstanding this it can hardly be of interest for the European theatre, since a western monogamy-minded audience can scarcely appreciate the Indian sentiment[1].

The Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa[2] "(The drama of) of Yaugandharāyaṇa (sticking fast) to his Promise"

1. The Svapnavāsavadatta must have become known and been appreciated long ago, since it has many a time been imitated by later poets. Cf. L. H. Gray, Vāsavadattā, Introd. p. 1 f.

2. Edited in the TSS No. 16, 1912. Hertel, Jinakīrtis

is closely associated in respect of its subject-matter with the Svapnavāsavadatta. It is a drama of entirely different type. The love, that in the Svapnavāsavadatta stands at the centre, goes wholly into background in this work. Neither Udayana nor Vāsavadattā, whose fate probably forms its subject-matter, appears on the stage. The hero of the piece is Minister Yaugandharāyaṇa, and it is his fate that stands at the centre of this drama. His statesmanship (*nīti*) and his fidelity to the king are the qualities that are praised ardently. The contest of the two ministers, Bharatarohaka and Yaugandharāyaṇa constitutes the moving motif in the dramatic development.

The drama in four acts narrates the story, that is narrated also in the Kathāsaritsāgara (II, 12-14) according to the Bṛhatkathā, how Udayana is brought on account of the prank of Bharatarohaka, the minister of King Pradyota of Mahāsena, with the help of an artificial elephant, inside which soldiers are found, as a prisoner into the kingdom of Pradyota. Here he trains Vāsavadattā, one of the daughters of the king, in the art of playing on lute and wins her love. The faithful Yaugandharāyaṇa hears the story from a spy, gets very much afflicated and takes the vow (*pratijñā*) to rescue the king:

yadi śatrubalagrasto rāhuṇā candramā iva ।
mocayāmi na rājānaṁ nāsmi yaugandharāyaṇaḥ ॥

"If like the moon, overpowered by Rāhu,
I free not the king, held up by the troop of the enemy,
I cease to be Yaugandharāyaṇa."

"Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla", p 123 ff., gives a summary of the contents. In the Svapnav. VI,18 the king says: "Thou art really Yaugandharāyaṇa. While drowning deep we have been rescued by thee through thy efforts and pretended madness, through battles as well as with thy clever plannings set according to the manuals of polity. This alludes to the story of the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. Cf. also above p.218, note 1. That the two dramas have the same author accordingly can hardly be doubted. P.D. Guṇe (Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, II, 1920-21, p. 1 ff.) compares the tales of Udayana according Kumārapālapratibodha of Jaina Somaprabha with those of the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa and the Kathāsaritsāgara. Since the promise (pratijñā) occurs only in Bhāsa, Gune does not believe that the Bṛhatkathā is the source of the three versions, which go back to historical events. Yet, however, the source may be the Bṛhatkathā. The stanza Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa III, 8 that with minor variants occurs in Hemacandra's Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita X, 11, 235, appears also in the Bṛhatkathā. But the comparison shows that it was an innovation of Bhāsa to place the promise at the central point of the drama. Hence also the title

In act III this vow is further extended when the minister says that he will not continue to be called Yaugandharāyaṇa if he does not bring back home the people, the elephants and Vāsavadattā together with the king. With this objective in mind he, dressed as a mad person, begins to run about the residence of Mahāsena for execution of his plan. The act III, in which the vidūṣaka and the two ministers in disguise converse among themselves in Prākrit, is full of subtleties, in which all that they say has two meanings and refers to the plan for rescuing the king[1]. But Yaugandharāyaṇa is not only a clever and faithful minister, but also a valiant hero in battle... After he has freed his master from imprisonment he is captured by the pursuing enemies after a bold defence, because he is dashed by an elephant with his tusk. Stately he appears as a prisoner and with a happy face he cries out: "victory is mine !", since he has rescued his master from the jail. Since "it is a matter of real luck for an unmarried man to fly into the forest: furthermore aggreable is the death for him whose desire has been fulfilled: and in fact there remains nothing for which he who has done his duty should repent[2]." Full of action is the scene in which Yaugandharāyaṇa, who is wounded and has been captured, meets his rival, the hostile minister Bharatarohaka, who rebukes him by addressing him as proud and self-conceipted prisoner. As against this, the end, in which, at the consent of the king for the marriage of Vāsavadattā with Udayana, everybody enjoys unlimited pleasure, is seemingly abrupt and unmotivated. The introductory scene of act IV, in which the drunk elephant-attendant appears, is not devoid of humour.

The drama Avimāraka (in six acts)[3] too seems

1. Till the present days the Cakkyars, a class of actresses in modern Kerala, play this act under the title Mantrāṅkanāṭaka, and this they do without knowing its connection with the drama of Bhāsa: see Gaṇapati, Pratimānāṭaka, Introd. p. XL.

2. *sukhaṁ khalu niṣkalatrāṇāṁ kāntārapraveśaḥ ramaṇiyataraḥ khalu prāptamanorathānāṁ vinipātaḥ apaścāttāpakaraḥ khalu sañcitadharmāṇāṁ mṛtyuḥ । mayā hi......jayaḥ prāptaḥ ।*

3. Edited in TSS No. 20, 1920. Beccarini Crescenzi, L'Avimāraka di Bhāsa, GSAI, Vol.28, was not accessible to Winternitz.

to have derived its plot from the Bṛhatkathā[1]. The following is the content of this purely narrative drama:

On account of the curse of a ṛṣi the son of the Sauvira king becomes a śvapāka, a man of the lowest caste, and assumes the name Avimāraka, "avi-killer", because he has killed an Asura Avi by name. He saves Kuraṅgī, the daughter of his maternal uncle Kuntibhoja, from a mad elephant. At this moment both of them fall in love with each other. Through the agency of the nurse of the princess a secret union of the loving couple takes place in the palace of the maiden. In act III is described with great dramatic art the entry of the prince in the guise of a thief into the palace through a window in a dark night as well as the appearance of the princess in his presence. The act ends with the words *yadyeṣā kṣaṇadā bhaved yugaśataṁ dhanyo madanyaḥ kutaḥ*, "in case this night be of 100 yugas duration, who will be fortunate other than myself". Between the acts III and IV passes a year of enjoyment of their happy secret love. Then this thing comes to the notice of the guard of the harem. Avimāraka is obliged to flee away and he gets completely perplexed. He wants to put an end to his life and jumps into a forest, that is in flames; but the flames of Agni are as cool as sandal and do not burn him. When he is about to kill himself by falling from a hill he meets a Vidyādhara, who gives him a magic ring, with the help of which it becomes possible for him to have secret union with his beloved. He appears before her just when she is going to commit suicide by hanging herself. In the meantime the duration of the curse comes to its end, and with the cooperation of wise Nārada, everything comes to a happy closure with the union of the loving couple.

Sage Nārada, here (as in the Bālacarita too) is represented humorously as the popular saint, who likes only string-music and quarrel. The vidūṣaka of the Avimāraka reminds us of the one of the Mṛcchakaṭika. He is an uncultured Brāhmaṇa, who is not able to read

1. Cf. Kathāsaritsāgara 16, 1112.

at all, but still helps towards bringing comical changes in respect of the literary work. Jokingly he says: *jannopavīdeṇa bamhaṇo | cīvareṇa rattapaḍo | yadi vatthaṁ avaṇemi·samaṇao homi* : "I am a Brāhmaṇa with my sacred thread, and with the dress of a beggar, a red-clothed person (i.e. a Buddhist monk) and when I put off my garment I become a Jaina monk (naked)". Like a typical joker he speaks with predilection for food. But on the other hand, he is the most faithful friend of the hero, who about him directly says that he is "witty in entertainments, a warrior in battle, teacher in grief, and bold against the enemy" (act IV, verse 21). In any case, these are the characteristics that are not known to be possessed by the typical vidūṣakas elsewhere.

In the Avimāraka the language is often very much artistic. Ornate similes and lengthy compounds prove familiarity of the poet with the kāvya-style. Thus for example at one place the heat of the sun is described with a bold comparison (IV, stanza 4):

atyuṣṇā jvariteva bhāskarakarairāpītasārā mahī
yakṣmārtā iva pādapāḥ pramuṣitacchāyā davāgnyāśrayāt |
vikrośantyavaśā divocchritaguhāvyāttānanāḥ parvatāḥ
lokoyaṁ ravipākanaṣṭahṛdayaḥ saṁyāti mūrchāmiva ||

"The earth resembles a patient suffering from fever, the trees appear as if suffering from phthysis, the hills look as if tearing their cave-mouths asunder and crying aloud, and the entire world appears to have lost its consciousness on account of the heat of the sun."

The most important, for the literary history of India, among the dramas of Bhāsa, is the Daridracārudatta[1]

1. Edited in TSS No. 39, 1914. [Ed. also by C. R. Devadhara, Poona, 1939]. Translated into Norwegian by Sten Konow in the journal "Edda", 1916, pp. 389-417. Winternitz says that he could not come to a decision with regard to the question whether the drama had come down to us in an incomplete form, or if this was the last work of the poet that he could not complete. Konow (Festschrift Kuhn, p. 107) says that Śūdraka has added six new acts to the four acts of the drama of Bhāsa and he has refashioned the whole work. In a private communication Konow had written to Winternitz that the former would try to prove this in a work of his disciple G. Morgenstierne that was in the press. Georg Morgenstierne, Über das Verhältnis zwischen Cārudatta und Mṛcchakaṭikā, Leipzig, 1921, indeed proves that Śūdraka's drama is a resetting of Bhāsa's Daridracārudatta and not (as Bhaṭṭanātha, ibid, p. 194, assumes)

("The Drama of poor Cārudatta)". Unfortunately it has come down to us only in a fragmentary form. But its four acts that we have upto the present time do not leave in our mind any doubt that the famous drama Mṛcchakaṭika[1], "The Drama of the Clay-cart", attributed to King Sūdraka, is a genial, elaborate and late adaptation (perhaps a continuation of Bhāsa's Daridracārudatta. In any case, the four acts of the Daridracārudatta and the first four acts of the Mṛcchakaṭika are related together in a way, that is as close as that existing between two different recensions of one and the same work.

We unfortunately are not in a position to state clearly whether the elaboration of the drama of Bhāsa in the form of Mṛcchakaṭika was executed soon after the time of Bhāsa or about a century later. About the poet Śūdraka we know

reversely cannot be an abridgment of the Mṛcchakaṭika; but the question, whether the drama of Bhāsa has come down as a torso and has been elaborated and continued by Śūdraka or whether Bhāsa had written more then four acts, as K. C. Mehendale (Bhandarkar Com. Vol. p. 369 f.) will like to prove cannot be decided. It is certain that four acts of the Daridracārudatta, as we know it, are a torso. Morgenstierne (ibid, p. 78 f.) correctly remarks that in no case Śūdraka was a plagiator. See also S. K. Belvalkar in Proceedings and Transactions of the First Oriental conference, Poona, 1920, Vol. I, p. LI f.

1. Critical edition of A. F. Stenzler, Bonn, 1847. Of the Indian editions that are worthy of being recommended are the one with two commentaries of N. B. Godabole, BSS No. 52, Bombay 1896 and the other with a commentary of P. H. M. Sanna Śāstrī and K. P. Parab in NSP (3d ed. Bombay 1909). German translations of O. Böhtlingk (St. Petersburg 1877), L. Fritze (1879) and H. C. Kellner (Reclaims Univ.-Bibl. 3111, 3112, 1894). English translation of H. H. Wilson, Select Specimens, Vol. I and of A. W. Ryder in HOS, Vol. IX, Cambridge Mass. 1905, [and R. P. Oliver, Illinios, 1938]. Appendix to it in JAOS 27, 1906, 418 ff. French translation of P. Regnaud, Paris 1876. There are also translations in Dutch, Swedish, Danish, Italian and Russian. Beiträge zur Erklärung by C. Cappeller in the Festgruss an Böhtlingk, p. 20ff., and A. Gawronski in Kuhns Zeitschrift für vergl. Sprachf. 44, 1911, 224ff. People have also tried to adapt the Mṛcchakaṭika for the European theatre. In Paris it had been adapted into French by Méry et Gerard de Nerval in the year 1850 and a new recast had been made by V. Barrucand in 1895. None of the two adaptations had more than a momentary success (see Lévi in Revue de Paris 1895, 1, 818 ff.). In the adaptation of Emil Pohl (Stuttgart 1892) the piece went also over to the German theatre under the title "Vasantasenā" and became for a time an attractive drama. Moreover, this adaptation contains much more than what was ever said by Śūdraka, nor has even been thought of in India. A. Hillebrandt (Alt-Indien, p. 159) directly calls it "rather a caricature than an adaptation suitable for stage. A brief and free German reproduction is the "Vasantasenā oder das irdene Wägelchen" of H. Haberlandt, Leipzig, 1893. Lion Feuchtwanger's adaptation (Münich 1916), a recent work written for the stage, keeps closer to the original than that of Pohl.

nothing beyond what has been said in the prelude in this regard. Here he says that the famous poet Śūdraka was, "the chief amongst the Aryans" (dvijas), a man possessed of excellent qualities of body and mind; he was a scholar of the Ṛgveda, the Sāmaveda, arithmetic, pornography and the science of elephants. He was cured of a serious eye-disease through the grace of God Śiva. After he saw his son in the office of the king, he performed a horse-sacrifice and he had attained the age of one hundred and ten days. But he ended his life by burning his ownself. On the earth he was equally famous for his skill in war and for purity of character. But since here we find a mention of the death of the poet royal, the three stanzas, in which these biographical data are furnished, must have first been added to the original work later (by somebody after the death of the poet, at the time of its presentation on the scene or in some revised adaptation) in the prelude[1]. As the king Śūdraka, moreover, is unknown in history—his name we find neither in inscriptions nor on coins, but only in tales and stories—it seems fruitless to attempt to determine his age[2]. It is not improbable that there was a rājā, who bore the epithet Śūdraka, on account of being of lowly origin, and had adapted the drama of Bhāsa afresh. In this drama we find revolution

1. The prelude itself is found substantially in the drama Daridra-cārudatta of Bhāsa.

2. A poet Śūdraka first of all finds mention in Vāmana's Kāvyālaṁkāravṛtti (3,2,4). The view that the author of the Mṛcchakaṭika is identical with the Ābhīra prince Śivadatta, who in the middle of the 3rd century A.D. overthrew the Andhra dynasty, as stated by Konow (Festschrift Kuhn, p. 108 f.), appears to have very weak foundation and stands in contradiction with regard to the age of Aśvaghoṣa and Bhāsa. [His opinion has been refuted by J. Charpentier, JRAS, 1923. p. 595 f.]. Jacobi (Bhavisatta Kaha von Dhaṇavāla, p. 83*A) has shown that act VI of the Mṛcchakaṭika could not have been written before the 4th century A. D. on account of the astronomical data found in it. Pischel (GGA 1883, p. 1229ff.) has expressed the opinion that the date of the Mṛcch. cannot be altogether very far away from the dates of the great classical poets, viz. Kālidāsa, and that its "earliest limit would be towards the end of the 5th century A.D." On the basis of its language, Gawroński (Kuhns Zeitschrift 44, 1911, 241 ff.) concludes that the "latest age-limit of the Mṛcchakaṭika is the 4th century A. D. The arguments by which Mehendale (ibid p. 367 ff.) tries to make it probable that Śūdraka lived in about 550-600 A. D. are weak. [Jolly, Hindu Law of Partition, Inheritance and Adoption, Calcutta, 1883, p. 68 f. shows that the legal procedure, as seen in act V, is usually found in law-books of the 6th and the 7th centuries.]

heralding in matters relating to manners and customs,[1] and in it a case of removal of a legitimate king by a cowherd has been described; besides we find predilection for Prākrit dialects in it and not for straight standard Sanskrit and notice certain deviations from the strict rules of dramaturgy, and lastly strong Buddhist spirit is permeating it — all this appears to go to point out that the author of the Mṛcchakaṭika does not belong to any of the two highest Brāhmaṇical castes[2].

The authors of older manuals of poetics do not appear to have held any high opinion regarding the merits of the Mṛcchakaṭika. They do not seem to consider this work as of sufficiently high standard for the purpose of quoting examples from it[3]. On the contrary in Europe, the drama has enjoyed high grade of popularity and has been always held in esteem. The work fully merits this honour. It deviates from the model more than any other Indian drama and it has been fashioned wholly on actual life. The characters are presented in a lively manner. The comic scenes with their firm humour are full of spirit and wit, and in the beginning scenes we find many passages that in the matter of tenderness and fervour remind us of the most beautiful places in the dramas of Kālidāsa. It is true that

1. E. Kuhn (Festschrift Vilhelm Thomsen, Leipzig, 1912, p. 219) stresses "the poetical heralding of a revolution in the drama Mṛcchakaṭika that is indeed attributed to a king by tradition" as characteristic of Indian interpretation of kingship. But the status of the poet comes to be known only through actual political events that occurred not long away from the time of the poet. The poet "Śūdraka" must have been a close friend of the usurper "Āryaka" .

2. Cf. Jacobi in the Literaturblatt für Orient. Philol. 3, p. 72 ff. Pischel (Rudraṭa, p. 13 ff.) had posed the hypothesis that Daṇḍin might have been the real author of the Mṛcchakaṭika. This theory, that in itself is based on weak foundation, loses its little force in the face of the fact that Daṇḍin was a wonderful master in respect of language, a quality that is wanting in the author of the Mṛcchakaṭika. Cf. also A. Gawronski, Sprachliche Untersuchungen über das Mṛcchakaṭika and das Daśakumāracarita, Diss. Leipzig 1907; Pandit Mahachandra Nyāyaratna in JASB, Proceed. 1887, 193 ff. und Böhtlingk in the preface to Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarśa.

3. He has first of all been quoted in the Kāvyaprakāśa. There is no old commentary on the drama. In any case, it is being staged down upto the present time in Ujjain. (See Jackson, JAOS 23, 1902, 317). [S. K. De, HSL, p. 242—Vāmana, already in the 8th century refers (iii, 2, 4) to a composition by Śūdraka, and also quotes two passages anonymously, one of which occurs also in the Cārudatta. Besides, the language of a bhāṇa, ascribed to him (Gray JAOS, XXVII, 1907, p. 419f.), shows that Śūdraka's grammar does not conform closely to the norm, a fact that indicates not only a departure from convention, but probably also his early date.]

primarily we know, in respect of the first four acts only, the extent to which the poetic beauty goes to the credit of Bhāsa and to that of Śūdraka.

The hero of the Mṛcchakaṭika is Cārudatta, a trader, by caste a Brāhmaṇa, who as a consequence of his enormous generosity has lost all that he had, and enters into the drama as wholly pauper. The heroine is Vasantasenā, a harlot, living in opulence and luxury, who loves the noble and virtuous trader passionately notwithstanding his poverty. She is seduced by the brute and uncultured brother-in-law of King Pālaka. By accident she comes under his power, but she refuses to obey him. He strangles her by the neck and believes her to be dead. Then he accuses the trader Cārudatta with the charge of murdering Vasantasenā. The judge's court, the scene of administration of justice is presented on the stage, and Cārudatta is ordered to be put to death. He is taken to the place of execution. When the sword is hanging over him, Vasantasenā rushes forth in the company of the monk, who has rescued her and then sets him free. At the same time the cowherd Āryaka, who with his followers has defeated Pālaka and has killed him, is declared king. The new king confers the status of a "lady" (*vadhū*) upon the harlot, so that she may become a rightful wife of the trader, and she is embraced by his first wife as her "sister".

Since a reference to Āryaka and Pālaka is wanting in Bhāsa, it has to be assumed that it was Śūdraka who in a historical manner has connected the love-story with a political intrigue. The inclusion of bigger scenes from popular life must be his work. The burlesque scene of a drama[1], a nocturnal burglary[2], and the detailed description of the palace of the harlot[3] and of the administration of justice and the scene of execution

1. This scene is wanting in Bhāsa, where it is deemed to have been reflected from behind the scene.

2. This occurs in Bhāsa too, where, however, the scene is smaller, but more dramatic.

3. This lengthy description is wholly wanting in Bhāsa. Here Maitreya says expressly; "How splendid is the palace of the harlot? Here sit strange fellows from different cities and read books. All sorts of dishes are prepared. They play on flute. The goldsmith carefully assembles together different kinds of ornaments.

offer the poet the opportunity for lively representation from actual life and for sketching of in-no-way ancient characters, some of whom occur already in Bhāsa: thus the brother-in-law of the king, a brute, uncultured, but passing for a cultured person on account of his status and influence in the court, the gallant Brāhmaṇa Śarvilaka (in Bhāsa, he is called Sajjalaka), who becomes a burglar on account of his love for the maid-servant of Vasantasenā, a bold but sympathetic creature throughout, and the masseur, who from a veteran gambler becomes a pious Buddhist monk. In the concluding acts of the Mṛcchakaṭika, auxiliary characters, such as the palanquin-bearers and the man-loving assistants of the executioner taken from the Caṇḍāla caste, are presented with little striking characteristics.

All these pictures and forms remind us much more of the popular narrative literature than of the stereotyped descriptions and characters of the court epics and dramas. Along with narrative literature, generally in prose, the Mṛcchakaṭika frequently has also admixture of narrative, descriptive and gnomic verses. In the first four acts the number of adages of this type is greater in Śūdraka than in Bhāsa[1]. Thus for example just in the beginning Śūdraka has increased the number of verses on poverty. In act IV in the Mṛcchakaṭika in the speech of Śarvilaka we have a number of adages on women, that are wholly wanting in Bhāsa. Thus for example the beautiful stanza:

striyo hi nāma khalvetā nisargādeva paṇḍitāḥ ।
puruṣāṇāṁ tu pāṇḍityaṁ śāstrairevopajāyate ॥

"The women are known to be born clever by nature;
But cleverness in men results from study alone."

Since the greater part of the drama in the work of Śūdraka is in acts V to X only, it seems necessary to pass on, in the meantime, to the most beautiful places of the work that is attributed to this poet.

So the act V begins with the masterly rain-scene[2]. In

1. The number of stanzas is throughout less in Bhāsa than in Śūdraka. Against 129 stanzas in the first four acts of the Mṛcchakaṭika, Bhāsa's Daridracārudatta has only 55 stanzas, of which 13 do not occur in Śūdraka. Of the 42 verses that are common only 2 are identical, all others appear with variants, that very often are very significant. Often it seems that Śūdraka has changed the verse simply to avoid his being plagarious.

2. In Bhāsa's Daridracārudatta the act IV ends in an allusion to a storm.

a multitude of rapidly running pictures Cārudatta describes the rainy night first of all, as in the verse :

etā niṣiktarajatadravasaṁnikāsā
dhārā javena patitā jaladodarebhyaḥ ।
vidyutpradīpaśikhayā kṣaṇanaṣṭadṛṣṭāś-
chinnā ivāmbarapaṭasya daśāḥ patanti ॥

"Streams of rains, looking like liquidified silver,
Are dripping with speed from the bodies of the clouds,
Hardly visible in the flame of brilliance of lightening;
They disappear in a moment and fall down
On the ground like filets of the dress of the sky."

We then see how Vasantasenā hastens in the dreadful night to meet her lover in the company of her associate—according to the convention of the Indian lyrics—in this duet are combined the descriptions of nature and erotics and the loving couple happily embracing each-other[1] in the stormy weather. Cārudatta calls out his friend, who abuses the bad weather :

vayasya, nārhasyupālabdhum—
varṣaśatamastu durdinamaviratadhāraṁ śatahradā patantu ।
asmadvidhadurlabhayā yadahaṁ priyayā pariṣvaktaḥ ॥

"Friend, do not accuse please—
May this bad weather continue for hundred years,
May it shower incessantly, may the lightening thrill,
Since it is a rare fortune—the sweet'heart is lying within my arms."

The rainbow becomes visible and Cārudatta points it to his beloved. And lastly they enter into their house with the beautiful verse that imitates the music of the rains in an almost untranslatable manner:—

tālīṣu tāraṁ viṭapeṣu mandraṁ śilāsu rūkṣaṁ salileṣu caṇḍam ।
saṅgītavīṇā iva tāḍyamānās tālānusāreṇa patanti dhārāḥ ॥

"Loudly on the leaves of the palms,
Lightly on the branches of the tree,
Hard on the rocks and stones,
Heavily into the streams and ponds,

1. About the description of the rainy weather in this dialogue R. Gottschall (Poetik, 2 Aufl. II,186) says that nowhere else do we find more beautiful a poem on the rains than that we have here. The passages have partly been translated into German by Oldenberg, LAI, p. 276 ff.

How in melody does the sound strike,
So fall the drops in a definite measure."

The Mṛcchakaṭika draws its title from the lively scene in act VI that may be translated here as follows:—

"Radanikā, a maid-servant in the house of Cārudatta, enters with the little son of Cārudatta.

Radanikā:—Come, lovely child, we shall play with the little cart.

Boy (weeping):—Radanikā ! What shall I do with the little clay-cart ? Give me the little cart of gold ?

Radanikā (painfully groaning):—Child ! whence shall I bring a golden cart ? When thy father will again become rich, thou wilt play with a golden cart.
However, now I like to detract him to a different topic and go to meet Vasantasenā. (She enters). I greet thee, Madam.

Vasantasenā: Welcome, Radanikā. Whose is this boy ? Even though he is not well decorated, he, with his moon-like face, is a source of rejoice to my heart.

Radanikā: Indeed, he is the son of His Highness Cārudatta. His name is Rohasena.

Vasantasenā (extending her arms):—Please come my child, embrace me. (Draws him into her lap.). Thy appearance is exactly like thy father.

Radanikā: I think not only the appearance, but also the nature. Hence His Highness Cārudatta is very happy with him.

Vasantasenā: Then why does he weep ?

Radanikā: He was playing with a golden cart, that belonged to a boy of the locality. He has taken that back away. When he was looking for it, I made this clay-cart and have given it to him. At this she says: Radanikā, what shall I do with this clay-cart ? Please give me the golden cart.

Vasantasenā: Alas, he is afflicted at the prosperity of others. Sublime Fate, Thou sporteth with man's lot that resembles the drops of water falling from lotus-eaves. (With tears in her eyes) Child, do not weep, Thou wilt play with a golden cart.

Boy: Radanikā, who is she there ?

Vasantasenā: A female slave, who has been won by thy father through his qualities.

Radanikā: The lady is thy mother.

Boy: What you say is not true. In case she be my mother, how can she be so well decorated ?

Vasantasenā: From thy innocent mouth thou uttereth highly painful words. (She puts off her ornaments, weeping). Thus now I have become thy mother. Please take this ornament and get a little golden cart made for thyself.

Boy: I shall not take it. Thou art weeping.

Vasantasenā (wiping her tears off): Child, I shall not weep. Go and play. (Fills the little cart with the bag of ornaments). Boy, get a golden little cart made for thee.

(Exit—Radanikā with the boy).

Certainly it is this scene, that is important also for the development of the plot, the work of a later collaborator, who on its account gave the new title to the drama.

The drama Mṛcchakaṭika is of extraordinary value in respect of cultural history, above all for our knowledge of the ways of harlots and that of their social status in ancient India. The harlot Vasantasenā lives in a palace provided with best luxuries. She has her own elephants and an elephant-driver as well as a large retinue of attendants. She is a highly cultured lady and is treated with high honour and regard by everybody except the uncultured Saṁsthānaka. Her servants are slaves, but they can become free on payment of a ransom. In the drama there is not the slightest hint noticeable that Cārudatta, who belonged to the caste of Brāhmaṇas, misbehaved, while he was loving the harlot. When, she is not free, she belongs to a despised caste, but after Vasantasenā has freed her slave Madanikā against payment of a ransom, the latter stands higher than her former mistress. This relation of love between Cārudatta and the harlot does not prevent that between him and his married wife loving each-other and they reciprocate in matter of showing respect. There is not the least amount of rivalry between the two wives. The end of the drama leaves the impression that Cārudatta was leading an honourable and

family life with his two wives, both of whom, he loved equally and both of whom loved him equally[1].

The drama is very much instructive also for a knowledge of relationship existing between the different castes and for that of religious practices. Cārudatta is a Brāhmaṇa by birth, yet he is a salesman. In the last act we find that the Caṇḍālas are people of lowly castes, yet their status is higher than that of the royal villain Saṁsthānaka. The Mṛcchakaṭika differs essentially from other classical dramas. In the latter the hero is always a model of virtue and bravery, the heroine, a model of beauty and amour; other chief characters too usually belong to a noble society, and a kind of conventional moral, from which basically there is not much deviation, permeates all these dramas. As against this stands the Mṛcchakaṭika, where although the heroine is a harlot and there take place chasing, theft, attempt for murder and other violent actions on the stage openly, there is laid strong emphasis on true propriety. He who is familiar with the moral teachings of Buddhism will not miss to see in this drama clear traces of moral teachings of Buddhism[2]. The poet Śūdraka appears to be a liberal Hindu with strong Buddhist inclinations[3].

Several points of contact with Bhāsa's Daridracārudatta and the Mṛcchakaṭika, still more with the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa of Bhāsa and also with the Tantrākhyāyika, that later became so famous under the title Pañcatantra is shown by the Mudrārākṣasa, "the Drama of Rākṣasa and his Signet

1. The scene in the last act, where the wife of Cārudatta attempts to burn herself, when she believes her husband to have been executed (Stenzler's ed., 325 ff.; Kellner's trans. 196 ff.) is an interpolation that is not found in all the MSS.

2. Particularly in act VIII prevails the Buddhist spirit. The monk calls Vasantasenā directly as "lay sister of Buddha" and brings her to one of the "sisters in faith" into the cloister. H. H. Wilson has already pointed to these tendencies and is of the opinion that the drama goes back to the period when Buddhism was in full blossom in India. Wilson believed that this was a proof of high antiquity of the drama. But we know today that Buddhism was yet alive in the 6th and 7th centuries in India and was being patronised by several rulers. It is remarkable that the new king Āryaka, at the end of the drama, makes the monk the head of the cloister. It will be very important for our drama in case it can be established as to where and when the right of selecting the head of all Buddhist monasteries was exercised by the rulers.

3. The opening prayer addressed to Śiva proves that he was not a Buddhist.

Ring"[1]) of the poet Viśākhadatta[2]). These points of contact suggest the hypothesis that this drama as well need not have been altogether widely separated from those works even in respect of time. And in fact there is some possibility in favour of the supposition that Viśākhadatta lived under the same Candragupta II, during the period of whose reign, as we have assumed, falls the age of the works of Kālidāsa[3]. At the central point of this remarkable drama stands—further, more than in the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa—politics (nīti). There is no talk about love in the whole of the drama. Among the characters, there appear a few individual women and that in small side-rôles.

Like the author of the Tantrākhyāyika, who wants to teach science of politics through fables, Viśākhadatta too in his

1. Editions by K. T. Telang, BSS No. 27, Bombay 1884 with the commentary of Ḍhuṇḍhirāja, and by A. Hillebrandt, Breslau 1912. Cf. also Hillebrandt in ZDMG 39, 1885, 107 ff.; NGGW 1905, 429ff. and Über das Kauṭilīya-śāstra and Verwandtes" (Sonderabdr. aus dem 86. Jahresbericht der Schlesischen Ges. für vaterländ Kultur), Breslau 1908, p. 13 ff. See Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. VII, p. 1589 on a commentary that explains the text from both the points of view poetico-dramatic and also politic (nīti). Translated into German by L. Fritze (Reclam, Univ.-Bibl. 2249), into English by H. H. Wilson II, 125ff. into French by V. Henry (Paris) 1888) and into Italian by A. Marazzi (Milan 1874). [An edition of the Mudrārākṣasa with a commentary and an English translation by M. R. Kale, Bombay 1900]

2. Several MSS mention the name Viśākhadeva. Mudrārākṣasa is the single work through which the poet is known.

3. In the concluding stanza (*bharatavākya*) of the actor there occurs the name of one King Candragupta. Kashi-Prasad Jayaswal (Ind. Ant. 42, 1913, p. 265 ff.) tries to prove that he can be simply Candragupta II and assumes that the drama was written in c. 410 A.D. So also Konow (Ind. Ant. 43, 1914, 64ff. Ind. Drama p. 70 f.) and V. A. Smith, Early History 120 n., Hillebrandt (Über das Kauṭilīyaśāstra, p. 25ff. and ZDMG 69, 1915, 363) assigns the work to the 4th century. Tawney (JRAS 1908, p. 910) agrees with him. Since some of the MSS read Rantivarmā or Avantivarmā for Candraguptaḥ, many researchers assign this piece to the eighth or ninth century. Cf. Jacobi, WZKM 2, 1888, 212 ff.; K. H. Dhruva, WZKM 5, 1891, 25 ff.; Telang, edition, Introd.; Lévi 225 ff.; Keith JRAS 1909, 148ff.; Rapson, ERE IV, 886. All that can be said as certain is that it cannot be placed later than the 10th century A.D., since it has been quoted in a commentary on the Daśarūpa. V. J. Antani (Ind. Ant. 51, 1922, 49 ff. tries to prove that the Mudrārākṣasa was written in the 7th century A.D. [Cf. also J. Charpentier, JRAS 1828, p. 586, also IHQ. 1931, p. 689.]

[The problem of the age of Viśākhadatta, according to S. K. De, HSL, p. 264, still remains unsolved, but there is nothing to prevent him from being considered as belonging to the older group of dramatists who succeeded Kālidāsa, either as a younger contemporary, or at some period anterior to the 9th century A.D., the earliest quotation from his work being found in the Daśarūpaka (10th century A.D.)]

drama wants to preach the same science. Polity, N ī t i, is directly the "heroine" of the drama, as the author, in the prelude, that has two meanings, has indicated in a significant manner.

Here the stage-manager calls for his wife in these words:

guṇavatyupāyanilaye sthitiheto sādhike trivargasya I
madbhavananītividye kāryādārye drutamupehi II

"Endowed with noble qualities, full of resources,
Stability-securing, means of attaining three-fold bliss[1],
Conversant with the politics of my house,
O noble lady, I have some work for you;
Do kindly come quickly to me."

This stanza, however, has a second meaning:—"O Nīti, thou art well-versed in the six kinds of political activities; thou art adept in the four ways of vanquishing the enemy, namely, peace, check, punishment and dissention; thou art the instrument of attaining the trinity (reduction, equalisation and increase of strength) on which rests the position (of wealth); thou wandereth in the business of my (kingly house); dost thou come here quickly for the purpose of rendering service in all the affairs of the state."

But it is remarkable that the poet has succeeded in developing a tight topic for composition of a dramatic kāvya from out of the material that appears to baffle any poetical treatment in a manner that this work can readily be placed by the side of the Mṛcchakaṭika. The poet was equally well-versed in the n ā ṭ y a ś ā s t r a, in stage-technique, as also in the n ī t i ś ā s t r a, in the science of polity. Occasionally he also thinks that the two sciences equally require great intelligence, although he compares the difficulties of a drama-writer with that of a politician[2].

The hero of the drama is C ā ṇ a k y a, the traditionally famous "master of falsehood" (Kauṭilya) and minister of the Maurya prince Candragupta, a Brāhmaṇa, who combines in his nature a glowing vehemence with straight

1. On these three objectives of life, see above, I, 272 A.; transl. p. 326.
2. IV, 3. In the beginning of act VI, a spy says—"How is it that here, as in the drama of a bad poet, the end does not agree with the beginning?

demonic cunning and a terrible unscrupulousness even in murdering people or in doing any disgraceful act. His counter-part is Rākṣasa, the minister of the last but still surviving scion of the royal house, brought to ruin by Cāṇakya. He is well-versed in all the intricacies of politics and he too does not hesitate in making use of any means that will help him in attaining his objective; but he possesses a tender heart and is determined to win over his opponent. The author presumes that the publicum already knows how Nanda, the king of Pāṭaliputra, once insulted the Brāhmaṇa Cāṇakya, and how in anger the latter untied his tuft of hair, śikhā, and took the vow that he would not retie it till after he had dethroned Nanda and had destroyed his relations and how he made Candragupta, a young man of a low-caste and living in the court of Nanda, the king, after he had dethroned the Nandas. But even now Cāṇakya has not fastened his lock of hairs, since there still survives one Malayaketu, a scion of the house of Nanda, to whom sticks fast his faithful minister Rākṣasa, who will not recognise the overlordship of Candragupta and is eager to punish his lucky enemy for the death of his master. But Cāṇakya likes not only to separate him from his master but thinks that his task will be over only when he has made him the minister of Candragupta and has thereby made his kingship fully confirmed. In the seven long, but in no way tedious, acts is described how Cāṇakya actually succeeded through tricks and intrigues, that often are so refined that it is hardly possible for the reader to follow him. His plans are executed with the help of spies, poison-girls and assacinations and he counteracts the plans of Rākṣasa. But most of the friends of Rākṣasa are paid spies of Cāṇakya. Yet, however, he has one real friend, the goldsmith Candanadāsa. He is prepared to sacrifice his own life before he can betray the family of Rākṣasa to the enemy. Candanadāsa is taken to the place of execution by the executioners, and in order to save his bosom-friend Rākṣasa puts his ownself into the hands of his hated enemy. In a really dramatic concluding scene Rākṣasa is involuntarily obliged to acknowledge supremacy of Cāṇakya in politics. Thus Cāṇakya is able to win

the heart of Rākṣasa. The latter, in order to save the life of his friend, agrees to become a minister of Candragupta. With this Cāṇakya has attained his goal and is in a position to refasten the lock of his hairs. The same Cāṇakya, who pursued his goal ruthlessly and unscrupulously, at the end leaves the place of the scene satisfied, since he knows that he has obtained for his king his successor, as minister, who is equally suitable as his ownself.

The character of the two ministers has been depicted in a masterly fashion. Unscrupulous in their Macchiavellistic politics, full of ambition, they have resigned themselves with unconditional fidelity to their masters in order to demonstrate their mastery in the art of intriguing. Even among the subsidiary rôles we meet with sharply outlined characters. The large number of spies, who appear in different disguising dresses, offer the poet opportunities for presentation of interesting situations from life of the common people, like that of the itinerant street-singer[1], moving about with the pictures of Yama, of the snake-charmer, of the executioner's servants etc.

Since Viśākhadatta does not follow tradition, so like his these characters, the plot too, in a greater measure, seems to be of the poet's own creation[2]. In the Mudrārākṣasa undoubtedly there lies hidden great erudition with ingenuity as well as real art of poetical representation. It is a genuine work of nītiśāstra-poetry, that has found a nice parallel in the Tantrākhyāyika. In the same way in which in this work was written as a manual of politics, that has become a world-famous narrative work, so also the Mudrārākṣasa, notwithstanding its high grade of

1. One such *yamapaṭika* is mentioned also in Bāṇa's Harṣacarita, and even during the present age in India such people carry about pictures of the hell. (See Frazer, Literary History of India, p. 295). As Takakusu had once communicated to W., in Japan upto the recent day there were beggars who moved about with pictures of the god of death and of his assistants, of the scenes of hell etc. painted on them (on paper, linen or silk), displayed them and sang songs on topics concerning them. The Indian *yamapaṭa* is called *yemma yezu* in Japan.

2. According to the commentary on the Daśarūpa 1, 129 the story may have been taken from the Bṛhatkathā. But in case in the Bṛhatkathā, there was nothing more about Cāṇakya than what we have in the Kathāsaritsāgara the entire plot probably appears as Viśākhadatta's own creation.

erudition is a first class work of Indian drama that is wholly ornate and has become popular like the famous book of fables.

The Classical Dramas of Kālidāsa, Harṣadeva, Bhavabhūti and Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa.

The most famous Indian drama-writer indisputably is Kālidāsa and his most famous drama is "The Śakuntalā", as it is called generally in European fashion after the name of its heroine, or the Abhijñānaśākuntala, i.e. "(the Drama) of the token of Identification (by which) Śakuntalā (was again found)"[1], as its actual title means. The Śakuntalā-drama is one of the first works of Indian literature, that became known to Europe. It was translated into English in 1789 by William Jones and from English into German in 1791 by Georg Forster. Even today people can hardly make a presentation of the inspiration that this work has effected in the whole of Europe, particularly in cultured literary circles of Germany. It was a great wonder that it came from the far away wonderland of India to Germany and there it was greeted with wonder and enchantment by eminent persons like Herder and Goethe. After this Herder kept himself busy with a series of most penetrating letters entitled "Über ein morgenländisches Drama", and above all in 1803 he brought out the second edition of Forster's translation and in its foreword he wrote an inspiring eulogy on this drama of Kālidāsa[2]. The famous couplet written in 1791[3] goes to prove the extent to which Goethe was enthused with this piece:—

"In case you desire to rejoice in the blossoms of early years,
the fruits of the age advanced,

1. Or perhaps:—"The Drama of Śakuntalā and her Re-identification", since *abhijñāna* can likewise mean both "identification" and the "mark of identification" (here "ring"). Cf. Böhtlingk's edition, p. 147; he gives the title "Ring-Sakuntala". V. Henry: "La reconnaissance de Śakuntalā".

2. Herders Werke, edited by B. Suphan, Bd. 16, p. 84 ff. and Bd. 24, p. 576 ff.

3. On May 17, 1791 Forster sent to him his just published translation, and on July, 1, Goethe sent the poem to F. H. Jacobi where it was written somewhat differently: "Shall I, the flowers of early" etc. Cf. Jubiläumsausgabe von Goethes Werken I, 258 and Windisch, Geschichte der Sanskritphilologie (Grundriss I, IB), p. 47A.

In case you want to have something that charms,
something that is enchanting
In case you want to call both the heaven and hearth
by a common name,
I refer you to the Śakuntalā,
And thus I describe these all."

And yet several years later old Goethe wrote to Chézy, the French editor of the Sanskrit text of the Śakuntalā[1]:—

"When for the first time I became aware of this work of unfathomable depth, I was filled with great enthusiasm and it attracted me in such a manner that even at the time when I had hardly finished its reading, it goaded me towards the impossible undertaking of adapting it, even approachingly, for the German theatre . . . I am still carrying the ineffaceable impression that this book made in me so early. Here the poet seems to be at the hight of his talents in representation of the natural order, of the finest mode of life, of the purest moral endeavour, of the most worthy sovereign and of the most sober divine meditation; still he remains in such a manner the lord and master of his creation. The fact that he has worked upon common and comical contrasts, must be considered as the necessary connecting link of the entire organisation[2].

The story that forms the theme of the drama is taken from the Mahābhārata and is known to the purāṇas. Apparently on it is based the story found in the Padmapurāṇa and in some works of similar type[3]. If, however, as has been assumed till

1. In a letter dated Oct. 9, 1830 (published in Hirzel's translation and in Goethes Werke, Weimarer Ausgabe, Abt. IV, Bd. 17, p. 284 ff.), in which he thanks him for sending to him the book.

2. Schiller too wrote to W. v. Humboldt, "that there is no poetical presentation of womanhood or of more beautiful a life in the whole of Greek antiquity, that might reach the Sakontala even from a distance. "Cf. P. Th. Hoffmann, Der indische und der deutsche Geist, p. 9 f.; 16f.; 22f., 35 f., 39 ff., 63.

3. See above I, 319 ff., 454, 466; trans. p. 376 ff., 540, 557. The motif of the lost and refound ring (that recurs, moreover, in Islamic and Talmudic Salomon legends) perhaps has been taken by Kālidāsa from the purāṇa. It is wanting in the Mahābhārata. That it is an old Indian motif is supported by the fact it has its parallel even in the Jātaka (No. 7; cf. also P. E. Pavolini, GSAI 19, 1906, 376; 20, 1907, 297 ff.). W. had already assumed in 1897 ,when he was working upon the South Indian recension of the Śakuntalā, that Kālidāsa had followed the Padmapurāṇa (see Ind. Ant. 27, 1898, p. 136). Later he found that the Bengali scholar Vihāri Lāl

the present day, the real source of Kālidāsa were the Mahābhārata in its undeveloped form, his skill should be deemed the more wonderful: in that case he should have the credit of having cut out the finest piece of art, that can simply be imagined by man, out of indeed a rough block. The Indian too consider the drama of Śakuntalā as the master-piece of dramatic poetry. There is current among the paṇḍitas the adage :—

kāvyaṣu nāṭakaṁ ramyaṁ
tatra ramyā śakuntalā ।
tatra ramyaścaturthoṅkas-
tatrāpi ślokacatuṣṭayam ॥

"Among the different types of poetry the drama is the most beautiful, among the dramas the Śakunalā, in it, the act IV,

Sarkār had already tried to prove in a Bengali book "Śakuntalārahasya" (Calcutta 1896) that the drama of Kālidāsa was based on the Padmapurāṇa. The question regarding the source of the Śakuntalānāṭaka and also the question whether the author of this purāna-text had or had not utilized the drama can be finally decided when we have before us a trustworthy text of the Padmapurāṇa and an accurate comparison becomes possible. Berthold Müller, Kālidāsas Śakuntala und ihre Quelle, has made a nice comparison between the Mahābhārata episode and this drama. (Dem Rektor und Lehrer des Gymnasiums zu St. Elisabeth, Bürgermeister der Stadt Breslau C. F. Ed. Bartsch . . . bei Vollendung seines 50. Dienstjahres den 21. Mai 1874).

["The story is told in the Mahābhārata, III, 225 (Bombay ed.) and the Rāmāyaṇa, 37. It was known to Aśvaghoṣa in some form, Buddhacarita, I, 88; XIII, 16 (S. K. De, HSL p. 128). "The earliest edition (Bengal Recension) is that by A. L. Chézy, Paris 1820. The drama exists in four (five) recensions (i) Devanāgarī, (ed. O. Böhtlingk, Bonn 1942, but with better materials, ed. Monier-Williams, 2nd ed. Oxford 1876, (1st ed. 1853); with the commentary of Rāghavabhaṭṭa, ed. N. B. Godbole, and K. P. Parab, NSP, Bombay 1883, 1922), (ii) Bengali, (ed. R. Pischel, Kiel 1877; 2nd ed. in the Harvard Orient. Ser., revised by C. Cappeller, Cambridge, Mass. 1922), (iii) Kāśmīrī, (ed. K. Burkhard, Wien 1884, and (iv) South Indian, (no critical edition, but printed with the commentary of Abhirāma, Śrī Vāṇīvilāsa Press, Srirangam, 1917, etc.). Attempts to reconstruct the text, by C. Cappeller (Kürzere Text-form), Leipzig 1909 and by P. N. Patankar (called Purer Devanāgarī Text), Poona 1902." A critical edition utilizing all the recensions has been undertaken by S. K. Belvalkar under the auspicies of the Sāhitya Akademy, New Delhi. Shri Ramānātha Jhā has recently (Darbhanga 1957) brought out the text of the 5th (Mithilā) recension with the commentaries of Śaṅkara and Harihara. The earliest English trans. was by William Jones, London, 1790; but trans. have been numerous in various languages. On text-criticism, see Pischel, De Kālidāsae Śakuntali recensionibus (Diss.), Breslau 1872 and Ind. Studien XIV, pp. 35-69, 161-311; Harichand, op cit.. p. 243 f. For fuller bibliography see Sten Konow, op. cit. pp. 68-70 and M. Schuyler in JAOS; p. 237. See also Haradatta Sharma, Kālidāsa and the Padmapurāṇa, Calcutta 1925, who follows Winternitz; cf. S.K. De, HSL, p. 140.]

and there too the four stanzas, namely those in which the sage Kaṇva bids farewell to his foster-daughter[1].

In the first of these verses Kaṇva says:

yāsyatyadya śakuntaleti hṛdayaṁ saṁspṛṣṭamutkaṇṭhayā
kaṇṭhaḥ stambhitabāṣpavṛttikaluṣaścintājaḍaṁ darśanam ।
vaiklavyaṁ mama tāvadīdṛśamaho snehādaraṇyaukasaḥ
pīḍyante gṛhiṇaḥ kathaṁ nu tanayāviśleṣaduḥkhairnavaiḥ ॥

"This very day Śakuntalā will depart; at such (a thought) my heart is smitten with melancholy (with grief on account of separation from her); my voice (throat) is agitated by suppressing the flow of tears; my sight is paralysed by anxious thought. So indeed through affection (is) the mental agitation of me, a hermit. How (much more) then, are heads of families afflicted with new pangs of separation from their daughters."

In the following stanza he implores blessings from the heaven for Śakuntalā and lastly he craves protection of the trees of the hermitage with the words:—

pātuṁ na prathamaṁ vyavasyati jalaṁ yuṣmāsvapīteṣu yā
nādatte priyamaṇḍanāpi bhavatāṁ snehena yā pallavam ।
ādye vaḥ kusumaprasūtisamaye yasyā bhavatyutsavaḥ
seyaṁ yāti śakuntalā patigṛhaṁ sarvairanujñāyatām ॥

"She, who never attempts to drink water first, when you have not drunk, and who although fond of ornaments never plucks a blossom out of affection for you, whose greatest-holiday (highest joy)is at the advent of the season of the first appearance of your bloom, that very Sakuntalā now departs for the house of her husband. Let her be affectionaly dismissed by (you)all[2]."

In the air resound the blessing voice of the sylvan divinity and with affection Śakuntalā takes leave of the animals and trees of the hermitage, her foster-father and her dear friends[3].

1. Quoted from G. R. Nandargikar, Raghuvaṃśa ed. Introd. p. 31 f.

2. The translation in the original is by L. V. Schroeder and here it is from H. H. Wilson.

3. In act V (Winternitz says Act IV) of the Pratimānāṭaka of Bhāsa the words *āpṛccha putrakṛtakān hariṇān drumāṁśca*. "take leave of the animals and trees, that have been accepted in place of children" and the whole sentiment and the scene (of Sītā in the hermitage) remind of act IV of the "Śakuntalā". It is possible that Kālidāsa might have borrowed it from Bhāsa. But there is no verbal correspondence.

The sage gives expression to his feeling in the words :—

artho hi kanyā parakīya eva tāmadya sampreṣya parigrahītuḥ ।
jāto mamāyaṁ viśadaḥ prakāmaṁ pratyarpitanyāsa ivāntarātmā ॥

"Since a daughter is verily owned by some other person, my soul feels very much content after I have sent her today to her husband, like one who has returned back to its owner the property kept in his custody."

In the sense in which the people of the West understand, in the poetry of Kālidāsa there is no drama at all. He, who will like to guage the depth of this deliberately constituted fable-drama with the measure-staff of Greek tragedy will not be able to appreciate at all its uncomparable beauty. It is absolutely necessary to let oneself plunge into the spirit of India for a moment, believe all that Indians believe, must have faith in the efficacy of curse, in spiritual communication between gods and men and in miracles of loss and recovery in the hermitage in order to be able to realise fully and enjoy the whole beauty of this wonderful piece of poetry. It has been said about this work that curse and blind chance execute all that is done here and man acts just like a doll[1]. However, Herder has tried to study the drama "with Indian and not European spirit". In any case, according to the Indian conception, an offence against an honourable saint is a grave sin and his curse is almost sure and unfailing. Likewise the loss and recovery of the ring is not a "blind accident" but a destiny, as Indians precisely understand, determined by divine disposition and human conduct (in earlier birth) at the same time.

These real characteristics of Indian poetry make their production on the European stage straightway difficult. Geothe had already been occupied with the idea of staging of the "Śakuntalā", but he soon gave it up[2]. Schiller too had once written to Goethe that he had studied the "Śakuntalā" with

1. Oldenberg, LAI 261.

2. It is, however, well-known, that the prelude to the drama "Faust" written in 1797 has been influenced by the prelude to the Śakuntalā. Cf. W. v. Biedermann, Goethe-Forschungen, Frankfurt a. M. 1879, p. 54 ff., and Windisch ibid p. 203 f.

the idea of finding out if it could be possible to make it suitable for the stage; but it appears that he had to face the difficulty of the stage, so much so that in a sense it seemed as if the drama was just opposed to the European stage. Probably the difficulty lay in the main characteristic itself, that is in tenderness, and in lack of movement, since the poet liked to interwine the feeling with certain opportune convenience, because the atmosphere itself came to rest[1]. Since then attempts have been made again and again for adapting the drama for the German stage. The famous adaptation of the "Śakuntalā" by A V. Wolzogen[2] is not an Indian drama at all, not to speak of a drama of Kālidāsa. In the year 1903 the adaptation of Marx Möller[3] was performed on the stage and it was rightly rejected by the good sense of the publicum. Indeed it was nothing but a caricature of the old Indian poetry. Probably Möller, as also Wolzogen, had erred inasmuch as they had tried to eliminate the supernatural, narrative and mythological elements from the the piece with the intention of making it look probable. On account of this the drama had become a hybrid composition, that was neither Indian nor European. The theatrical adaptation of L. von Schroeder[4] is free from such mistakes, since here the Indian drama has been reproduced most faithfully, as far as possible, and still in it the requirements of the European stage have been kept in view to the extent it was feasible. It has remained a narrative drama, what the "Śakuntalā" of Kālidāsa must always be. It is not understandable why the narrative

1. Briefwechsel zwischen Schiller und Goethe (Stuttgart, Kollektion Spemann) II, p. 310 (letter dated February 20, 1802).

2. Reclams Univ.-Bibl. No. 1209. G. Meyer (Essays und Studien II, p. 98) remembers about the performance of this "Śakuntalā" in the State Theatre of Breslau "that did not enthuse the publicum otherwise".

3. Sakuntala, ein indisches Spiel des Königs Kalidasa in deutscher Bühnenfassung. Berlin o. J. (According to the newspaper report) the majestic outfit and singularly splendid stage paintings had had their success, but the effect was not lasting. When the author says that his adaptation is "pure and unmixed Kālidāsa", his statement is as correct as the one, when he says that Kālidāsa was a king—on the contrary it is unreal, adulterated and diluted Kālidāsa.

4. Romantisches Märchendrama in fünf Akten und einem Vorspiel frei nach Kalidasa für die deutsche Bühne bearbeitet. München 1903. It is regrettable that upto this time no attempt has been made for its performance. Cf. R. Böhme in the Sunday Supplement of the "Vossischen Zeitung" of Sept. 13, 1903, and H. Stümcke, "Die deutsche] Sakuntala", in the journal "Bühne und Welt" 5, 1903, June number, that gives a historical review on the German translations and adaptations.

dramas, like those of Raimund and Gerhard Hauptmann, should evoke such a little appreciation from the publicum[1].

The popularity of the Śakuntalā-drama in the whole of India[2] has resulted in the condition that the text of the work has not come down to us in an uninterpolated form. As in the case of other much-read pieces of Indian literature, we have , in the case of the Śakuntalā too, several recensions that correspond to the different regions of India. Scholars have distinguished between a Bengali, a Kashmirian, a Central Indian and a South Indian recensions of this work. Whilst Pischel[3] most passionately conceded for the Bengali recension, although, it, as already admitted by him, was very much distorted with interpolations, and described the South Indian recension as the worst and "mixed recension", there are other researchers who believe that the latter represents the original work most closely. A. Weber has already shown the possibility that none of the recensions, that we have, is exclusively genuine and that one has the original text here and the other has it there. But it is questionable whether the expression "recension" is quite appropriate. The different compilations do not appear to rest on critical studies, rather they seem to have gradually assumed different forms under the hands of the copyists of the different regions[4].

1. Attempts have been made for making the Śakuntalā suitable also for the opera and ballet:. Sakuntala, Ballett in zwei Akten und fünf Bildern, nach Kalidasas Dichtung, Musik von S. Bachrich, in Szene gesetzt by by C. Telle, Wien 1884. In Paris Gautier had presented on the stage a ballet "Śakuntalā', with music by Reyer (Lévi 426). In England the Śakuntalā was staged for the first time in the year 1899 (on the basis of the translation of Monier Williams) by the Elizabethan Stage Society in the garden of the Royal Botanic Society in London. A recent performance took place in the summer of 1922 at Cambridge with the cooperation of Indian students. It was performed five times in succession in the Royal Albert Hall Theatre, London in January 1913 (see Athenaeum, Aug. 10, 1912, p. 150 and W. Poel in Asat. Quart. Review N. S. 1, 1913, 319 ff.).

2. It nas been staged several times till recently at Ujjain; see Jackson, JAOS 23, 1902, 317. P. Deussen (Erinnerungen an Indien, Kiel and Leipzig 1904, p. 125f.) had seen a performance at Lucknow, Garbe (Indische Reiseskizzen, Berlin 1889, p. 37 ff.) in Bombay.

3. De Kālidāsae Śākuntali recensionibus, Diss., Breslau 1870; De grammaticis Pracriticis, Breslau 1874; Die Rezensionen der Śakuntalā, eine Antwort an Herrn Prof. Dr. Weber, Breslau 1875. Against his view A. Weber, Ind. Stud. 14, 35 ff. and 161-311. Cf. also Harichand, Kālidāsa, p. 243 ff.

4. Cf. C. Cappeller in the Jenaer Litteraturzeitung 1877, No. 8 (112). Even Pischel, KG 179 f. says:—"Reconstruction of the original text is impossible. We must be content with the philological method to get to

Consequently it comes that each of the four recensions, in case we are allowed to say so, presents good readings, and probably interpolations as also alterations occur in all of them[1].

The second drama of Kālidāsa, the Vikramorvaśīya (the Drama of winning Urvaśī through Strength)[2], or "Urvaśī", as it is often designated after the name of its heroine, is a narrative drama, in which mortal beings have active and reciprocal communication with gods and demi-gods. It is an

the original as closely as possible". According to Pischel (NGGW 1873, 189ff) there is planned abridgment and distortion of the text in the South Indian recension. Konow (Ind. Ant. 37, 1908, 112) holds that it is a fact that only the Bengali recension provides us with good Prākrit. A. Hillebrandt (GGA 1909, No. 11) agrees with the eclecticism of Cappeller (in this edition, Leipzig 1909). On textual criticism of the Śakuntalā see also B. K. Thakore in the Proceedings and Transactions of the First Oriental Conference 1920, 1, p. LXff.

1. First of all the Bengali recension became known through the above-mentioned translations of W. Jones and G. Forster. It was published (with French translation) by A. L. Chézy (Paris 1830) and by R. Pischel (Kiel 1877). The Central Indian recension (commonly called the Devanāgarī recension) was published by O. Böhtlingk (Bonn 1842) with an accurate German translation and by K. Burkhard (Breslau 1872). Burkhard eventually brought out the Kashmirian manuscript in SWA 1884. Of the large number of Indian reprints and editons the following may be mentioned:—the first one (Calcutta 1761) and also of P. N. Patankara (Poona 1889) with an English translation, as well as that of N. B. Godabole and K. P. Parab (with the commentary of Rāghavabhaṭṭa), 3rd. edition Bombay, 1891, NSP. On the Calcutta edition by Saradaranjan Ray see Lévi, JA 1910, s. 10, t. XVI, 395 ff. The Bengali recension has been translated into German by B. Hirzel (Zürich 1833, 2. Aufl. 1849), in a far better manner by L. Fritze (Chemnitz 1877). Friedrich Rückert (1855) had, on the basis of the edition of Böhtlingk, planned a translation into German that was hardly meant for publication, (see the one edited by Heinrich Rückert from Friedrich Rückerts Nachlese Leipzig 1867, p. 291 ff.; cf. Rückert Nachlese I, 293 ff.). The most faithful and at the same time the most readable translation of the Central Indian recension is that of H. C. Kellner (in Reclams Univ.-Bibl.). Free poetical rendering by E. Lobendanz (Leipzig 1854, 7th impression, 1884). Ernst Meier (Stuttgart 1852), G. Schmilinsky (Dresden and Leipzig 1900). The most famous English translation is that of Monier Williams; the best French translation is by A. Bergaigne. Besides there are translations in almost all the European languages. Cf. also Schuyler, JAOS XXII, p. 237 f.]

2. This is probably the correct translation of the title, since Purūravas rescues with his strength Urvaśī from the control of a demon, and with his strength he helps the gods in their fight against the demons; he wins her and loses her again. In the first act Citraratha praises his bravery (*vikrama*). According to the commentator Kāṭavema, Purūravas too bore the epithet *vikramāditya*, and so according to him the title means "the drama of Vikrama and Urvaśī. Cf. also Rückert in the Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik 1834, p. 971 and above p. 45 note 6. In the prelude of the work the drama has been mentioned as a nāṭakā in several MSS, while in others it is called rūpaka (see above pp. 186-87). [The Northern recension calls the drama a troṭaka—S. K. De, HSL, p. 139 note..]

extremely old tale of the love of King Purūravas and the apsaras Urvaśī, that we find narrated also in the Ṛgveda, the Śatapatha-brāhmaṇa and in the purāṇas[1], that has been retold in this lyrico-dramatic poetry, half show-play, half opera.

Again here it is a curse that has been pronounced on account of excessive love and brings about the tragic complication. Indra, however, tones down the force of the curse that Urvaśī will live on the earth with Purūravas so long as she does not see the face of his son born from her. This curse becomes effective, and so in the first three acts Purūravas wins the love of the divine nymph. In the remarkable fourth act is included the performance of a real lyric interlude, a song-play in the middle of the drama. On account of the feeling of jealousy, full of anger, Urvaśī loses control over her senses , forgets the instruction that no woman should enter into the grove of the kumāra, rushes forth straightway into it, and there she is immediately transformed into a liana and she disappears away from the sight of the king. Mad with grief on account of the loss of his beloved, Purūravas now strolls about searching for her in the forests and in the planes[2]. He takes the cloud hovering over his head for a demon, who has robbed him of his wife. He hastens to catch it, but soon he has the bitter experience and he comes to know that it is simply a cloud. He at once calls forth the peacock and asks him if he has not seen his beloved, and then a female cuckoo. Then addressing a flamingo, he says that he must have seen his beloved at the place. Had it not been so, he would not have otherwise got this light graceful movement. He has certainly stolen her. But the bird flies up in fear that he is being accused of theft by the king. From a lotus-blossom he hears humming of a bee and with folded hands he implores:—

madhukara madirākṣyāḥ śaṁsa tasyāḥ pravṛttiṁ
varatanurathvāsau naiva dṛṣṭā tvayā me ।

1. See above, I, 90f., 181f., 380f., 454 (trans. 10f., 209f., 445f. 495f.). The story, as narrated by Kālidāsa, stands most closely to the one narrated in the Matsyapurāṇa, already noted by Wilson, Theatre I, 190 off.

2. In a similar manner Damayantī searches for Nala, who has disappeared (Nalopākhyāna XII) and Rāma (in the Rāmāyaṇa III, 60ff) for Sītā, carried away by Rāvaṇa.

yadi surabhimavāpsyastanmukhocchvāsagandhaṁ
tava ratirabhaviṣyatpuṇḍarīke kimasmin ||

"Intoxicated with honey, please do tell me about
the lady with intoxicated eyes;
But no; you have certainly not seen the decoration of
the charming lady;
Had you smelt the fragrance emitting from her
breath,
What pleasure could you get in sticking fast to this
lotus[1]."

Again, he sees a royal elephant, whom he asks in vain for information about his beloved. He looks at the mountain and with imploringly folded hands he asks him if he has not seen his beloved. The mountain gives no reply, but the king hears the resounding sound "seen". He lets himself be carried away by a mountain stream and believes that his beloved has been transformed into the brook. He wants to appease her with soothing words, but she swings away. Then he realises that it is just a stream and not Urvaśī. After long wanderings, at last, his glance falls on a black slab of stone. It is a stone that is possessed of the magic power of reuniting together the separated beings. He lifts this stone and hurls it at once with irresistible force at a liana. He embraces it—and Urvaśī rests between his arms[2]. Years of happy association are described in acts IV and V. Then a vulture robs the red brilliant uniting stone. But soon comes the happy news that the bird has been pierced with an arrow and that the stone has been recovered. The fortunate shooter is a Kṣatriya boy, who has been brought up by a female

1. The translation is according to Rückert, Jahrbücher für wissenschaftl. Kritik 1834, where at p. 968 he has given a detailed account of the contents with interspersed translation into German of some of the songs and stanzas; see also Rückert-Nachlese I, 295 ff. [In the translation, however, *madhukara* "bee" has purposely been rendered as "intoxicated with honey]".

2. The manuscripts too give indication of the melodies according to which the song's are to be sung, and also the measure, according to which the movements are to be executed in the fourth act, that is adapted greatly for music. That this thing suits the Indian taste is proved by the large number of imitations that it has evoked, so by Bhavabhūti, Rājaśekhara and others. Cf Pischel, GGA 1885, 760; 1891, 366; Lévi 180. Rud. Gottschall (Poetik II, 186) says about this act that "he could consider it as the most beautiful monodrama of all times."

sage living in the forest-hermitage. He is brought before the king, who is told that he is a son of Purūravas, born of Urvaśī, and he is concealed from the couple, since according to the order of Indra Urvaśī is to stay with him only till he has seen the face of his son. The king, who does not know about it, feels very much happy and gets sunk inside the vision of his son. But soon his happiness comes to an end, when Urvaśī is taken away, as she is obliged to part with his company. A tragic conclusion, in a European drama appears unavoidable. But it is not so in an Indian drama. Therefore, exactly in the critical moment there appears the sage Nārada and he brings the message of Indra, the king of gods, that the latter needs the services of Purūravas in his fight against the demons, and therefore, he has bestowed upon him the boon that he should live till the end of his life in the company of Urvaśī.

Curse, magic-stone, divine messenger—these are things that, in the opinion of the people of the West, appear as too much of dependence on the supernatural powers for breaking of the knots for dramatic treatment. But the Occidental people can just say that it was not too much for Indian listeners and spectators, and that they had absolute faith, and that they considered all as possible and natural, what appears to the people of the West as arbitrary interference in human behaviour. The great popularity that this drama has enjoyed in India is proved also by the fact that there are several recensions of its text that are so different from one another that the original text of Kālidāsa cannot be established with certainty[1]. The South Indian manuscripts in particular show variations and abridgments and in

1. Critical editions by R. Lenz (Berolini 1833) with Latin trans., with German translation (Saint Petersburg 1846) by F. Bollensen, [by Monier Williams, Hertford 1849] and by S. P. Pandit (BSS, No. 16, Bombay 1879). [Ed. with the commentary of Kāṭayavema, by Charudev Śāstri, Lahore 1929. English translation by Cowell, Hertford 1851; German translation by L. Fritze, Leipzig 1880; French translation by P. E. Foucaux Paris 1879.] The South Indian recension has been edited by R. Pischel. (Monatsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 1875, p. 609 ff.). [A. Barth (RHR 19, 1889, 130=Oeuvres II, 5 f.) says that a better pendant to the story of Purāravas and Urvaśī cannot be found than the ballad of King Rasālū in Temple's "Legends of the Panjāb". See also Sten Konow, Indische Dramen, pp. 65 f.]

them the Prākrit, stanzas, that are put in between Sanskrit musical stanzas in Bengali and Central Indian manuscripts, are notably wanting. It is still a controversial question whether or not these Prākrit-stanzas are to be taken as genuine[1].

The Vikramorvaśīya too has often been translated into German and other European languages, and attempts have been made for adapting it for the stage too[2].

A poetical composition of an entirely different type is the third drama of the great Indian poet, the Mālavikāgnimitra, "the Drama of Mālavikā and Agnimitra[3]. It is an intrigue drama - as it seems, a free invention of the poet[4]— in which is reflected the life in the court and in the harem of India of the mediaeval age. In the mind of the people of the West it is nearest to "comedy" and reminds them in many respects

1. Against the genuineness of these stanzas that are in Apabhraṁśa Shankar P. Pandit (Introduction to his ed p. 9ff. and Th. Bloch (Vararuci und Hemacandra, Gütersloh, 1893, p. 15 ff.) have advanced very strong grounds. H. Jacobi (Bhavisattakaha von Dhaṇavāla p. 58 A) as well considers as arbitrary (the insertion of these stanzas) and thinks that they form the libretto for a pantomime. According to K. H. Dhruva (see Jacobi, ibid) these stanzas were interpolated firstly during the age of Hemacandra) with the intention to make the understanding of the contents of the fourth act easy for the audience not knowing Sanskrit. R. Pischel, who has brought out a recent compilation of the Apabhraṁśa stanzas (Materialen zur Kenntnis des Apabhraṁśa, Berlin 1902, AGGW N. F. Bd. 5, Nr. 4), and Konow (GGA 1894, 475 f.) consider these songs as genuine. [See also U. N. Upadhye, Introduction to Paramātmaprakāśa, Bombay, 1937, p. 56 note.]

2. German translations by Bollensen (see above), K. G. A. Hoefer (Berlin 1837), B. Hirzel (Frauenfeld 1838), E. Lobedanz (Leipzig 1861 and the best one by L. Fritze (Reclams Univ.-Bibl. No. 1465). There are several translations in English (besides that of Wilson, Theatre I) and in French as also in Swedish, Italian, Spanish, and Czech. In 1888 A. Hillebrandt (Alt-Indien, p. 155) wrote that the drama had sometime before been played on the stage in München. G. Meyer (Essays und Studien II, 100) says that the splendid equipment of the Indian model of the flattering "Urvaśī" contributed to its success; but the composer had to apologise as librettists in this respect, since the opera was lacking in dramatic life."

3. Edited [with the commentary of Kāṭayavema] by Shankar P. Pandit BSS No. VI, Bombay 1869. Ed. F. Bollensen, Leipzig 1879; [by K. P. Parab, NSP, Bombay 1915. Further Bibliolography in Sten Konow, Ind. Dramen, p. 63.] The edition of O. F. Tullberg (Bonn 1840) is not good. On criticism and explanation cf. C. Capeller, Observationes ad Kālidāsae Mālavikāgnimitram, Diss. Regimonti 1868; F. Haag, Zur Textkritik und Erklärung von Kālidāsas Mālavikāgnimitra, Frauenfeld 1872; Bollensen, ZDMG 13, 1859, 480ff.; A. Weber, ZDMG 14, 1860, 261 ff. [Editions also by Bollensen, Leipzig 1879, K. P. Parab, Bombay 1915. Cf. Bollensen, ZDMG XIII, p. 480 ff. and Konow, Ind. Dramen, p. 69.]

4. The hero, however, is a historical personality. Agnimitra is a son of Puṣyamitra, the founder of the Śuṅga dynasty (about 185 B C.); see Smith, Early History 198 ff.

of the comedies of Shakespeare. People have had wrongly believed that Kālidāsa could not have been the writer of this comedy on the ground that it is very much different from his other dramas. It is self-evident that in this comedy the dominant motif is different from that of the other two dramas, besides in it we find more of humour, wit and gaity. However the fact that humour is so much over-shadowed and that wit is most moderate points to its authorship of Kālidāsa.

This comedy, however, does not lack in gravity and dignity, that are so characteristic of our poet. At the place where he presents on the stage a dance-show he does not miss to put in the first place a sober word into the mouth of Master Gaṇadāsa about the religious importance of the art of dancing:—

devānāmidamāmananti munayaḥ śāntaṁ kratuṁ cakṣuṣāṁ
rudreṇedamumākṛtavyatikare svāṅge vibhaktaṁ dvidhā ।
traiguṇyodbhavamatra lokacaritaṁ nānārasaṁ dṛśyate
nāṭyaṁ bhinnarucerjanasya bahudhāpyekaṁ samārādhanam ॥

"A harmless sacrifice is the dance,
Enjoyable to the eye: so say the wise :
God Śiva, who has united into one
His own body with that of his consort Umā;
He has divided it into two.'
"So he dances both violently and calmly.
At the time he dances, there generate,
From his dance, the mani-fold activities
In the world, the bliss, the passion, the dark;
The three aspects of the spirit;
And there in the dance
Becomes manifest the singular means of rejoicing
For all the people of different tastes and inclinations:
What is that ? That is nothing but dance[2]."

Sober and full of mirth is also the entry of the Buddhist nun, who knows to encourage the intrigues of the vidūṣāka for the benefit of the two in her intelligent ways. But the

1. A. Weber in the foreword to his German translation (Berlin,) 1856) and Shankar P. Pandit (preface to his edition, p. XXIIIff.) have thoroughly refuted the hypothesis raised against the authorship of Kālidāsa first of all by Wilson (II, 345).

2. I, 4, translation according to the German rendering by Fritze.

king Agnimitra, in nature, is not different from Duṣyanta and Purūravas; full of most tender outlook and most exquisite courtesy towards both of his wives, to whom he is "unfaithful" as the people of the West will like to say, although from the standpoint of Indian poligamy the term unfaithful, in the sense of the people of the West, is hardly relevant. At the end, it is also the first queen Dhāriṇī herself who decorates and guides the young beautiful woman to the place of her husband, at which the nun makes the wholly noteworthy comment:—

naitaccitraṁ tvayi |
pratipakṣeṇāpi patiṁ sevante bhartṛvatsalāḥ sādhvyaḥ |
anyasaritāmapi jalaṁ samudragāḥ prāpayantyudadhim ||

"Not at all astonished I am at this
Large-heartedness exhibited by thee:
The women are faithful to their husband
To the extent that they serve him
Even against odds and take to him
Even his recently married wives,
Like the rivers that flow down into the sea
And carry to the ocean
Also the water of other rivers."

But the dialogue and the language of the entire drama show the same spirit that we are accustomed to find elsewhere in Kālidāsa. And in case there be any doubt about the authorship of Kālidāsa it will certainly be set aside through the charming scene in act III, where Mālavikā makes the Aśoka-flower blossom. According to an Indian popular belief this tree is forced to blossom when a beautiful woman touches it with her foot - only a poet like Kālidāsa, the unexcelled painter of nature, to whom nature and man always appear as a single harmonious whole in such a way that each and every human feeling gets reflected in nature—could have succeeded in so majestically demonstrating such beliefs in his drama. There is no forceful ground to consider the Mālivikāgnimitra as the first dramatic composition of the poet[2].

---

1. V, 19, translation according to the German rendering by Fritze.

2. So Shankar P. Pandit (Ed. Preface p. XVI f.). Lév

This drama too has repeatedly been translated into German and other European languages and twice adapted for the German stage[1].

We meet again an important dramatist-poet first in famous King Harṣadeva, who is credited with the authorship of the three dramas, Ratnāvalī, Priyadarśikā and Nāgānanda [2]. Ratnāvalī[3] and Priyadarśikā[4] belong to the category of nāṭikā. In the two pieces the hero is the

166 and Pischel (KG 201). V. Henry (Litteratures de l'Inde, p. 312 f.) considers this piece superior to the "Śakuntalā". Hillebrandt, Kālidāsa, p. 59 is of the opinion that the Mālavikāgnimitra is "the earliest work of Kālidāsa." [Against this see S. K. De, HSL, p. 136, footnote 2.]

1. German by Weber (Berlin 1856) and L. Fritze (Reclams Univ.-Bibl. No. 1598); English by C. H. Tawney (2nd ed. London, 1891) and by G. R. Nandargikar (Poona 1879); French by F. Foucaux (Paris 1877) and V. Henry (Paris 1889). A quite free stage-adaptation is by L. von Schroeder (Prinzessin Zofe, München 1902). The most recent adaptation by Lion von Feuchtwanger (Der König und die Tänzerin, München 1917) adheres closely to the original; in its first performance in the Münchener Kammerspielen on March 5, 1917 it had a sympathetic success" (according to LZB of March 17, 1917).

2. Cf. on the three dramas F. Cimmino in OC XIII, Hamburg 1902, p. 31f., and Jackson in JAOS 21, 1900, 88ff. That the three dramas were written by one and the same author can be concluded from the fact that the words, with which the sūtradhāra begins the prelude, that he will stage a drama of the poet and king Harṣadeva, are in the three dramas verbatim almost identical. The weak ground in support of the commonly current opinion that Harṣadeva did not himself write the dramas, but they were written by some poet of his court does not stand. If Nāgojibhaṭṭa, in his commentary on Govinda's Kāvyapradīpa (beginning) says that, a poet "Dhāvaka" wrote the Ratnāvalī in the name of King Harṣa and obtained much money for this, probably his remark is based on the wrong reading [Dhāvaka for Bāṇa, that is found in some of the Kashmirian manuscripts] and on a wrong explanation of the passage in the Kāvyapradīpa. Cf. Bühler, Ind. Studien 14, 407 [and Jackson. Introduction to the Priyadarśikā and S. K. De, HSL, p. 255 ff.]. In the manuals of poetics not seldom are the model examples taken from the dramas of Harṣadeva. [That Śrīharṣa was himself a writer of dramas is proved by the fact that Dāmodara Gupta, in his Kuṭṭinīmata (ed. Km. III, 1887. pp. 98-99, 104-105), written in the 9th century, mentions one Ratnāvalī attributed to Harṣa, while Yi-tsing (7th century) refers to dramatisation of the story of Nāgānanda (Takakusu, A Record of Buddhist Religion, p. 163-64)].

3. Ed. by C. Cappeller in O. Böhtlingk's Sanskrit Chrestomathie, 3rd. Ed. 1909, p. 326 ff.; by N. B. Godabole and K. P. Parab, 2nd ed. NSP. Bombay 1890, and with the commentary of Nārāyaṇaśarman by Krishnarao Joglekar, Bombay 1913, NSP. German by L. Fritze, Chemnitz 1879. English by Wilson II, 255 ff. [Ed. also by Krishnanatha Nyāyapañcānana with the commentary of Śivarāma, Calcutta 1864].

4. Edited by V. D. Gadré, Bombay 1884 NSP; [R. V. Krishnamachariar, Srirangam 1906]. French by G. Strehly, Paris 1880, (Bibl. Or. Elz. 58). [Edition with English translation and notes by A. V. W. Jackson and C. J. Ogden, CUIS, New-york 1923].

well-known Bṛhatkatthā-famous Vatsa-king Udayana, who falls in love with the maid-servant of his first queen and at last takes her into his palace, after he comes to know that she is a princess. The motif is the same as that of the Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa[1]. Even though the two dramas do not belong to the first rate Indian poetry, we find in them many original and beautiful scenes.

A cheerful picture from Indian life is the spring-festival (vasantotsava) observed in honour of the god of love (Kāmadeva) in the first act of the Ratnāvalī. There the girls sing and dance. With them the jolly fool mixes up and flirts. The king too rejoices the cheerful picture and strolls merrily in the lovely park, where the queen too arrives instantaneously with her attendants for worshipping Kāma and to enjoy the spring. Among her attendants the queen has one Sagarikā (who is called also Ratnāvalī, "the pearl-garland", after the garland of pearls, by which her identification as a princess gets disclosed later), the heroine of the drama, with whom the king falls in love, and in whom she finds an incarnation of Cupid. In acts II and III is described how the queen comes to know about the love-affairs in course of events, when she finds Sagarikā painting a picture of the king. This enrages the jealous, but highly haughty queen, who comes to know about the king as indulging in love. We are reminded of the style of Subandhu and Bāṇa, when the king tries to appease the queen with the words:

prasīdeti brūyāmidamasati kope na ghaṭate
kariṣyāmyevaṁ no punariti bhavedabhyupagamaḥ ।
na me doṣostīti tvamidamapi ca jñāsyasi mṛṣā
kimetasminvaktuṁ kṣamamiti na vedmi priyatame ॥

"In case I say, please be appeased,
That will not be proper, since angry you are not;
In case I promise, I shall not do it again,
This will amount to confession of guilt;
If I say even this: I am not at fault,

1. Bhāsas Svapnavāsavadatta, that has the same theme as the Ratnāvalī, does not seem to have been known to Harṣadeva. A different view has been expressed by Lacôte, JA. s. 11, t. XIII, 1919, 523f.

That too you will consider as false:
In this situation, I know not what to say"[1].

In act IV the resolution of the difficulty takes place through communication of a report on the political events, with the help of messages, prepared from before and through an original magical performance. A magician enters, who first of all makes the gods Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahman, Indra Vidyādharas and Siddhas appear and lastly shows the harem set on fire[2]. At this the king rushes forth to save his beloved from burning and brings her within his arms out of fire. Now she is identified as the princess of Ceylon, who was lost in a shipwreck, and it becomes clear that all this had been done by the wise minister who was induced to arrange for the marriage of his master with Sagarikā on account of a prophecy[3].

The Priyadarśikā depends more on the Mālavikāgnimitra than does the Ratnāvalī. Historically Harṣa, however, is the first poet, who has first of all inserted "a play within a play", and since then later poets have many a time imitated him[4].

One of the interesting pieces of Indian literature although it is a total failure as a drama, is the Nāgānanda, (the

1. II, 19 translated into German by Fritze. Such a harmony in the matter of style with that of Bāṇa does not naturally go to prove that he is the author of this drama. There is nothing astonishing in the fact that both the king and his court-poet belonged to the same poetical school.

2. According to Lüders (SBA 1916, p. 711) this magical representation was presented on a screen with the help of shadow-figures.

3. The poet Mātrarāja or Ananghaharṣa, in his drama Tāpasavatsarājacarita, from which extracts have been given by E. Hultzsch, NGGW 1886, 224 ff., has also dealt with the theme dramatised by Bhāsa and Harṣadeva. Since Abhinavagupta has referred to this drama, it must have been written before the close of the 9th century A.D. Probably Mātrarāja followed the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya, see Lscôte, JA s. 11, t. XIII, 1919, 508 f. His originality lies in the fact that he makes Udayana become an ascetic in dispair after the death of Vāsavadattā.

4. The play covers the whole of the act III and has been composed by a nun, named Sāṁkṛtyāyanī. The Indian dramaturgist calls this type of "show-play within show-play" used also by Shakespeare, by the expression garbhāṅka (embryo-act, i.e. an act that contains the embryo of a drama). Cf. Jackson, in the American Journal of Philology 19, 1898, 242 ff.

Drama of the) joy of Nāga" in five acts[1], that like a mosaic consists of three very much different parts.

The hero is the Vidyādhara prince Jīmūtavāhana, who reveals his Buddhist ideas about the negation of existence in the very beginning of the first act. Once in the company of the vidūṣaka, he listens to the fully charming lute-music played by Malayavatī, the handsome daughter of the Siddha king, who offers her prayer in a temple of the goddess Gaurī. At this Jīmūtavāhana, not only by sweet music, but also on account of her beauty, in spite of his Buddhistic renunciation of the world, gets so much charmed at the young damsel that he begins to love her at the first sight. Although we know that their marriage is already predestined by the goddess Gaurī and that it has been decided upon also by their elders, we are told in two lengthy acts that the pair is exceedingly love-stricken and melancholic, because each of the two lovers has the feeling of not being liked by the other. This is their condition till upto the time when they are united. In case it was meant to be a comedy, the drama should have ended here. But in act III it is followed by a nonsensically violent scene, that we hardly find anywhere else in the whole of Indian literature. The marriage of Jīmūtavāhana and Malayavatī is solemnized and drinking plays a great rôle in it. A drunken courtier (viṭa) enters in an extraordinarily motely garb with a cup in his hand, and he is escorted by a servant, carrying a vessel of burnt wine on his shoulder. Merrily be shouts aloud:

ṇiccaṁ jo pibaï suraṁ piāsaṁgamaṁ ca jo kuṇaï ।
maha de do adhidevā baladevo kāmadevo a ॥

"There are two faultless gods, as I feel:
The one is Baladeva, who always drinks only wine;
The second is god Kāma, who, I think,

1. Edited by Govinda Bahirav Brahme and Dhiravam Mahadeo Paranjape, Poona 1893, and by Gaṇapati Śāstrī in TSS No. 59, 1917 with the commentary of Śivarāma, translated into English by Palmer Boyd, London 1872 and [Hale Wartham, London 1911] into French by A. Bergaigne, Paris 1879 (Bibl. Or. Elz. 27), into Italian by F. Cimmino, Palermo 1903.

Unites men with their beloved[1]."

He is waiting for the maid-servant, who had promised him to meet. But in a drunken state he takes the vidūṣaka, who arrives just then, for the maid-servant and lets him fall by the neck. Soon, however, there comes the maid-servant in person and both of them crack jokes, particularly with the vidūṣaka, in which they ridicule his Brāhmaṇism in a manner that nowhere else occurs in the dramas of earlier ages. Whilst this scene is being presented in a garden, there comes the loving married Jīmūtavāhana with his equally modest beloved young wife, and the young husband indulges forth in verses that remind us of the musical stanzas of Amaru, expressive of his feeling of amiability for his young wife. It is beautiful, when raising her face up and gazing at it, he says: "Darling, I have unnecessarily troubled you to see the flower-garden on account of my carnal appetite—

etatte bhrūlatollāsi pāṭalādharapallavam |
mukhaṁ nandanamudyānamatonyat kevalaṁ vanam ||

"Your face alone is the garden of the heaven,
In which the eyebrows shine forth like creepers,
And the lips look like leaves of the pāṭala-plants;
All other gardens are nothing but forests."

Very dramatic it is when this amorous conversation is prolonged through the joke of the maid-servant with the vidūṣaka that is relished by the young married couple. But all on a sudden this interesting scene gets interrupted by the report that the enemies of the empire of Jīmūtavāhana are approaching near. And now, in a highly remarkable manner our hero, a devout Buddhist, at once bursts forth and says that he has nothing to do with these affairs, since he knows a single enemy, the sin.

The two following acts are mere dramatisation of the Buddhist legend. Jīmūtavāhana appears as a Bodhisattva in the sense of the Mahāyāna Buddhism, when he says:—

śayyā śādvalamāsanaṁ śaśiśilā sadma drumāṇāṁadhaḥ
śītaṁ nirjharavāri pānamaśanaṁ kandaḥ sāhayā mṛgāḥ |

1. Retranslated from the German rendering of J. J. Meyer, who had reproduced the whole scene in the introduction to the "Altindischen Schelmenbüchern" I (Leipzig, 1903), p. XXIV ff.

ityaprārthitalabhyasarvavibhave doṣoyameko vane
duṣprāpārthini yatparārthaghaṭanā bandhyairvṛthā sthīyate ||

"Here one has the bed of hay,
The clean slab of stone his seat,
He has his abode under the trees,
He drinks pure cool water of the spring,
And lives on roots of trees, and
He has deer as his companions:
All these objects of enjoyment
Are available, without being asked for:
But the single defect that we find in the forest
Consists in the fact that here the needful
Are difficult to be found whom one
May render any help; so he passes a useless life,
Devoid of getting a chance to assist others."

On the sea-shore Jīmūtavāhana's glance falls on a heap of bones and he comes to know that they are those of the Nāgas, the 'snake-gods", who have been killed and devoured by Garuḍa. There is an agreement executed between the king of snakes and Garuḍa that the former will everyday offer the latter voluntarily one of the Nāgas, so that he may not make the race of the latter become extinct. Then there comes a loudly weeping mother, who is escorting her son, a Nāga-prince, upto the place where he will be held up by Garuḍa. Now Jīmūtavāhana wishes nothing but to offer his ownself to save the Nāgas. He persuades him to be allowed to be replaced.

The terrible giant-bird appears and drags Jīmūtavāhana up into the air at once. But soon the former, after he has put the half-consumed prince on a slab of stone before his ownself, becomes aware of the fact that he has erred and notices a peaceful grace on the countenance of his victim and comes to know that here is a Bodhisattva whom he has killed. He believes that he cannot atone for this sin otherwise than by burning his ownself. But Jīmūtavāhana convinces him that the right form of atonement for him will be to take the vow of never killing any living-being.

Then he dies uttering the real Māhāyānistic concluding words:

saṁrakṣatā pannagamadya puṇyaṁ
mayārjitaṁ yatsvaśarīradānāt ।
bhave bhave tena mamaivameva
bhūyātparārthaḥ khalu dehalābhaḥ ॥

"May I, as a consequence of the noble deed that I have performed today by protecting the snake with the sacrifice of my body, be born again and again in this very way in order to be able to render service to others."

His parents, Malayavatī and the Nāgas break into tears and prepare themselves to enter into the funeral fire. Malayavatī, however, prays to the goddess Gaurī, who instantaneously appears on the scene and sprinkles the liquid of ambrosia over the dead, so he comes to life again. Garuḍa showers the liquid of nectar on the bones of the dead Nāgas, who too regain their life[1]. But the goddess Gaurī explains that Jīmūtavāhana, as a reward for his noble deed, will become the ruler of the Vidyādharas and he (who no more belongs to the class of Bodhisattvas, it is strangely, praises the goddess and is very much gratified at this favour[2].

Nāgānanda can hardly be considered to be a Buddhist drama. Notwithstanding the introductory prayer offered to Buddha, it is the goddess Gaurī, who does everything and brings the drama to a happy conclusion. And according to the prelude the drama was staged not perhaps on the occasion of some Buddhist celebration, but in the festival of Indra. Yet

1. Probably hence the title "Joy of Nāga", see F. D. K. Bosch, de legende van Jīmūtavāhana in de Sanskrit Litteratur, Leiden 1914, p. 181.

2. In an apparently accurate correspondence with the Nāgānanda, the legend is narrated in Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara 22 and 90 and in Kṣemendra's Bṛhatkathāmañjarī 4, 49 ff. and 9, 766 ff. Bosch, ibid p. 90 ff., has shown that Harṣadeva knew and used the Kathāsaritsāgara in both the recensions in which it has come down to us in their original form (the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇādhya ?). In earlier Avadāna literature the legend is unknown. Upto this day we have not found within the region of the Buddhist edifice the Jīmūtavāhana-legend (see Bosch, ibid, p. VIII f.). I-tsing, however, tells us that the king Śilāditya had rendered the story of the Bodhisattva Jīmūtavāhana in verses, and that the poetry of his time was tuned to music and was staged by actors for the purpose of propagation. (Takakusu, I-tsing, pp. LVI, 163 ff.).

the time of the drama falls within the period when Harṣadeva had fully become conversant with Buddhist ideologies under the guidance of Hiuen-Tsang and was inclined towards Buddhism[1].

When the Indians themselves speak about their greatest dramatists, they mention next to Kālidāsa first of all Bhavabhūti. He lived in the court of Yaśovarman of Kanauj in the first half of the 8th century A. D.[2] He had adopted the surname Śrīkaṇṭha and was born in an old Brāhmaṇa family of Vidarbha (Berar, South India), where the Taittirīyaveda was studied. His grand-father's name was Bhaṭṭa-Gopāla, his brother was Nīlakaṇṭha and his mother was Jātukarṇī. He himself was a man of great learning, well-versed in the Vedas, in the Upaniṣads, as well as in the philosophical systems, Sāṁkhya, Yoga and Vedānta. All his plays were staged in the feast of the god Kālapriyanātha, whose famous shrine at Ujjayinī is mentioned by Bāṇa and Kālidāsa. He knew the poetical works of Kālidāsa and had utilized them. Bhavabhūti has earned the fame not so much on account of his skill in dramatic technic, but on account of his mastery in the use of the Sanskrit language. From the linguistic point of view he is the most prominent Indian poet. He brings in natural pathos and knows to give expression, in an entirely particular way, to violent emotions, great natural scenes and the sentiments of heroism and furiousness. As against this he is lacking in humour. To him dramatic art is such a serious affair that he feels shy in bringing into his dramas the joker (vidūṣaka). The long

1. In act V Jīmūtaketu, the father of the hero, is devoted to the Sun-god. The consort of Śiva guides the destiny in the drama that contains a Buddhist legend. This position strongly lends support to the authorship of Harṣadeva whose inclinations were divided between Śiva and the Sun-god on one hand and the Buddha on the other, as we have already seen above (p. 51 f.).

[2. "Bhavabhūti has said nothing about the time when he lived... The inference is possible that he had to struggle hard for fame and future ... In view of this, it is surprising to find that the Kashmirian chronicler Kalhaṇa mentions Bhavabhūti, along with Vākpatirāja, as having been patronised by King Yaśovarman of Kānyakubja. Obviously this Vākpatirāja is the author of the enormous but unfinished Prākrit poem Gaüḍavaha, which glorifies Yaśovarman, and in which the poet acknowledges his indebtedness to Bhavabhūti in eulogistic terms. As this poem is presumed to have been composed in 736 A.D., before Yaśovarman's defeat and humiliation by King Lalitāditya of Kashmir, it is inferred that Bhavabhūti flourished, if not actually in the court of Yaśovarman, at least during his reign in the closing years of the 7th or the first quarter of the 8th century". —S. K. De, HSL, p. 279.]

compounds used in prose passages go to prove that his poems are rather more suitable for reading than for staging purposes. In particular his two Rāma-dramas are little dramatic.

The Mahāvīracarita or "the Biography of the Great Hero[1]" treats in its seven acts the subject-matter of the first six sections (kāṇḍas) of the Rāmāyaṇa, beginning with Rāma's visit into the hermitage of Viśvāmitra upto his return to Ayodhyā. It is rather a free compilation of dramatic scenes brought into one place, from the epics, than an actual drama.

Just a little more dramatic is the Uttararāmacarita, "the Second-part of the Biography of Rāma[2], that (likewise in seven acts) narrates the story of Sītā, discarded by Rāma, and corresponds to the Uttarakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa. Only in acts IV and VII, the poet has deviated from his model, and it is only in acts I and VII that we have vestiges of somewhat dramatic life. The poet, however, in this drama finds abundant opportunities for presenting the pathos in its real perspective and in generating in an efficient manner in the mind of his audience the feeling of the sentiment of pity (karuṇarasa).

In act I, Rāma, Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa are reflecting among themselves upon a number of paintings, in which the whole story of Rāma is presented upto Sītā's fire-ordeal, brought by an artist. Laksmaṇa explains the

1. Edited by F. H. Trithen, London 1848; [Anundaram-Borooah (Calcutta 1877): critical edition based on important manuscripts by Todar Mall, (Oxford Univ. Press 1928, Punjab Univ. Publ.] Also with the commentary of Vīrarāghava by T. R. Ratnam Aiyar, S. Rangachariar and K. P. Parab, Bombay 1910, NSP (first edn. 1892). Eng. trans. by Joh Pickford (London 1871, recent reprint 1892). Table of contents in Wilson II, 323ff.

2. Edited with the commentary of Vīrarāghava by T. R. Ratnam Aiyar and V. L. Sh. Panasīkar, 4th ed., Bombay 1911 NSP [1st ed. 1899]; [with the commentary of Rāmacandra Budhendra, Madras 1882; ed. with the commentary of Ghanaśyāma (1st half of the 18th century), by P. V. Kane (Bombay 1921); C. Śaṁkararāmaśāstrī with the the commentary of Nārāyaṇa, Madras 1832; by S. K. Belvalkar (text only), Poona 1921; ed. S. K. Belvalkar, vol. I, containing English trans. and introd. only (HOS 1915.)] English translation by Wilson I, 275 ff. and C. H. Tawney, 2nd ed., Calcutta 1874. French translation by F. Néve, Brusselles and Paris 1880 and by P. 'Alheim. C. Bois-le-rois. 1906. Besides see Schuyler in JAOS, XXV, 1904, pp. 1891 for fuller bibliography; see also Sten Konow Ind. Drama.]. A scene from Act IV translated into German by Oldenberg, LAI, 278 ff. Cf. Senart, JA 1881, s. 7, t. XVII, 562 ff. [There are two recensions of the Uttararāmacarita, see Belvalkar JAOS, 34, 1915, 428 ff.].

pictures, and while reflecting upon these, they are reminded of the life that they have had led together. We mark the sincere affection and tenderness with which Rāma and Sītā hold fast to each other. On account of reflecting upon the picture Sītā feels tired and drowsy. Rāma addresses her in affectionate words and she lays her arms about him.

Sītā—*piaṁvada, saïssaṁ* ।
Rāmaḥ—*kimanveṣṭavyam* ।
āvivāhasamayādgṛhe vane śaiśave tadanu yauvane punaḥ ।
svāpaheturanupāśritonayā rāmabāhurupadhānameṣa te ॥
Sītā—(*nidrāṁ nāṭayantī*) *atthi edaṁ ajjaütta* ।
atthi edaṁ (*iti svapiti*) ।
Rāmaḥ—*kathaṁ priyavacanā vakṣasi prasuptaiva* ।
iyaṁ gehe lakṣmīriyamamṛtavartirnayanayor-
asāvasyāḥ sparśo vapuṣi bahalaścandanarasaḥ ।
ayaṁ kaṇṭhe bāhuḥ śiśiramasṛṇo mauktikarasaḥ
kimasyāḥ na preyo yadi punarasahyo na virahaḥ ॥
Sītā—"Flatterer, come, let us sleep".
Rāma—"My dear, what is it, thou art seeking for ?"
"Ever since the time of our marriage,
At home, in the forest,
In our childhood and youth,
What has been bringing thee to sleep,
And on which no other woman has ever reposed,
That arm of Rāma is here, the pillow for thy head."
Sītā--(Simulating sleep). It is so my husband; it is so my husband.
Rāmā—How now, she, a speaker of agreeable words, has fallen asleep on my bosom.

"She is the goddess of fortune at home, she is the nectar-collyrium for my eyes; to my body her touch is as agreeable as that of thick sandal paste; her arms encircling my neck is as cool and smooth as a necklace of pearls; what is there, that is hers, which is not sweet, in case I do not have the misfortune to suffer her unbearable separation."

Through this picture the most tender conjugal affection is generated only to be merged into the tragedy of conflicts in which Rāma gets plunged as soon as he hears that the people talk unkindly about him that Sītā

has stayed in the house of an enemy and yet Rāma has accepted her as his wife. And only in case we try to understand the Indian standpoint with regard to the ideas about the wife, we shall be able to appreciate the depth of mental conflict and pain that Rāma suffers, when he is obliged to abandon sinless Sītā on account of the popular will.

Between the first and second acts, there elapses a period of twelve years, and the acts II-VI merely describe the well-known events of the birth of the son of Rāma till upto his meeting with Sītā taken from the Uttarakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa.

All the subjects as well as the gods and the demi-gods are present beside Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa and witness a drama composed by Vālmīki. The play within the play[1] begins. In a very dramatic manner the drama and realities are mixed together. Rāma becomes wholly unaware of the fact that it is just a drama. The mother Earth and Gaṅgā take Sītā under their care. At first Rāma laments that he has discarded his faithful wife but Gaṅgā justifies him, and the gods convince with facts and figures the people, who are assembled, that Sītā is chaste and sinless, so that at the end she is the reunited with her husband and children.

The most significant drama of Bhavabhūti is the Mālatīmādhava, "the Drama of Mālatī and Mādhava[2]" in 10 acts. In case Mahāvīracarita is a hero-drama (vīrarasapradhāna), the Uttararāmacarita is a pathetic piece (karuṇarasapradhāna) and the Mālatīmādhava is like-wise a love-drama (śṛṅgārarasapradhāna), in which love is extolled with ardour and pathos, a thing that perhaps we do not find

1. See above p. 253 and Jackson, American Journal of Philology, 19, 1898, 244 f.

2. Edited by R. G. Bhandarkar with the commentary of Jagaddhara, BSS No. XV, Bombay 1876, 2nd ed. 1905, with the commentaries of Tripurāri and Jagaddhara by M. R. Telang and W. Sh. Pansīkar, Bombay 1905, NSP; with English translation by M. R. Kale, Bombay 1913. German transl. by L. Fritze (Reclams. Univ. -Bibl. No. 1844). French transl. by G. Strehly with a preface by A. Bergaigne, Paris 1885. [The NSP edition, in fact, contains the commentary by Nānyadeva that was revised by Jagaddhara; one of the earliest editions is that of C. Lassen, Bonn. 1832.].

frequently in India, and here the principle that other sentiments, such as the abominable (bībhatsa), the wonderful. (adbhuta), the painful (karuṇa) and the heroic (vīra) should be presented on the stage, as stated by the poet in the prelude, finds a powerful expression.

In a very interesting prelude, in the dialogue of the stage-manager and his assistant, the poet states his own ideas about the dramatic art:

bhūmnā rasānāṁ gahanaḥ prayogaḥ
sauhārdahṛdyāni viceṣṭitāni I
auddhatyamāyojitakāmasūtraṁ
citrā kathā vāci vidagdhatā ca II

"A drama should be full of depth with the presence of a large number of sentiments; one ought to expect in it a treatment where the feeling of friendship may become highly manifest and love may appear stronger through rude activities; its theme should be interesting and there should be clarity in expression[1]."

The poet, with his boastful self-conceit, makes the stage-manager say that the drama that he wants to stage is regulated strictly according to his direction and his idea is:—

ye nāma kecidiha naḥ prathayantyavajñāṁ
jānanti te kimapi tānprati naiṣa yatnaḥ I
utpatsyate mama tu kopi samānadharmā
kālohyayaṁ niravadhirvipulā ca pṛthvī II

"Those persons, who slander us and do not understand, I tell them that this work is not meant for them. The space of time is endless and the world is wide; so a person, who thinks and struggles like me, may not be wanting."

Further he says:—

yadvedādhyayanaṁ tathopaniṣadāṁ sāṁkhyasya yogasya ca
jñānaṁ tatkathanena kiṁ nahi tataḥ kaścidguṇo nāṭake I
yatpraudhitvamudāratā ca vacasāṁ yaccārthato gauravaṁ
taccedasti tatastadeva gamakaṁ pāṇḍityavaidagdhyayoḥ II

"What relevancy is there in speaking about scholarship in the Vedas or about study of the Upaniṣads, of the

1. Rendered into English from the German translation of L. Fritze.

Sāṅkhya and of the Yoga, in case a drama derives no advantage from all these. However, when in it, the expression is perfect and noble and the theme is sober and deep-thought that shows scholarship and culture[1]."

Klein[2] has designated the Mālatīmādhava as "the Romeo and Juliet drama of India with a happy termination." But the comparison becomes inappropriate when we find that the fathers of the loving couple are not implacable villains, as Capulet and Montague; but on the contrary they have agreed for the marriage of their children. Now since Nandana, who wants to make Mālatī his wife, is a favourite of the king, her father is obliged to affiance her to him. But when the two are found loving each other, their parents become very much happy at the end. But the upholder of the whole story is the Buddhist nun Kāmandakī[3], who is the proper heroine of the drama. She succeeds in persuading Mālatī and Mādhava to surrender to each other, and notwithstanding all obstacles the two get married at the end and become a happy couple. This splendid personality of Kāmandakī, who has so little to do with religion, so that we would not be able to recognise her as a Buddhist nun, in case in the prelude she were not expressly mentioned as such[4] and who possesses so much of worldly wisdom that there is nothing concerning man that is unknown to her, the motherly friend of both the lover and the beloved, who, like a mother, sheds tears when her protege is married to her husband, is probably the poet's own creation. The theme itself, to a great measure, appears to have been a creation of the poet, while some of the topics must have been taken from the stock of the Bṛhatkathā[5].

1. The translation given here is according to the German rendering by Fritze.

2. Geschichte des Dramas III, 135. Kleine (ibid III, 51) has called Bhavabhūti "the Shakespeare of India", but it is a case of exaggeration.

3. The name has been selected intentionally with the idea of reminding us of the author of the Nītisāra. Since this nun is simply a lady diplomat, who has a worthy counterpart in Yaugandharāyaṇa of the dramas of Bhāsa and in Cāṇakya of the Mudrārākṣasa.

4. The assistant speaks to the stage-manager at the end of the prelude: "the main rôle, that is of the old Buddhist nun Kāmandakī, has been prepared by your ownself, boss, whilst I am ready with that of her disciple Avalokitā."

5. Cf. Kathāsaritsāgara 104.

In this drama Bhavabhūti has understood more deeply and more seriously the problems of erotics than has been done by most of the Indian poets. The act VI of our drama falsifies the often-levelled criticism that the people of India were ignorant of what the people of the West call "true love".

> Mādhava and his friend see from a temple the procession of the marriage of Mālatī with a groom whom she does not like. The procession stops just before the temple. Mālatī, escorted by her friend Lavaṅgikā and the nun, enters into the temple. Mādhava and his friend hide themselves behind a pillar and listen to the conversation of Mālātī with her friend. She tells her that she will like to die, since she has not the good luck of having the person whom she likes to be her husband. She futher leaves a message for her lover, who hears it from the place of his hiding and this elicits from Makaranda the words "*saiṣā paramā sīmā snehasya*, this is the extreme limit of love." Mādhava, at a hint from Lavaṅgikā, comes out from his hiding and takes her place. But Mālatī, in the dim-light of the temple does not notice him at first and, further driven in love, she embraces him (Mādhava), thinking him to be her friend, and lastly comes to know that it is her lover who is between her arms—all this presents an extraordinary effect at the time of reading and must necessarily be so on the screen. Likewise dramatic is the entry of the Kāmandakī, who blesses the fortunately united pair, and while the marriage-party with the undesired bridegroom is waiting outside in the dark of the temple, she solomnises the marriage of the realy loving couple with the words:—
>
> *preyo mitraṁ bandhutā vā samagrā*
> *sarve kāmāḥ śevadhirjīvitaṁ vā* ।
> *strīṇāṁ bhartā dharmadārāśca puṁsām*
> *ityanyonyaṁ vatsayorjñātamastu* ॥
>
> "Let this be known to my two children, that the most intimate friends, the whole group of relations as well, fulfilment of all desires, the best treasure, life itself—all this is the husband for a woman, and for a man a faithful wife is all this."
>
> In the same manner as Bhavabhūti has depicted the highest spiritual love here, so also in act VII, we find him

describing sensuous love with equal force. He cites an expression from the Kāmasūtra[1]:

kusumasadharmāṇo hi yoṣitaḥ sukumāropakramāḥ tāsvanadhigataviśvāsaiḥ prasabhamupakramyamāṇāḥ samprayogavidveṣiṇyo bhavanti I

"Women are like flowers; man should approach them politely; he who comes close to them in a violent manner, before he has gained her confidence, for him love becomes odious forthwith."

The poet reveals his accurate knowledge of "the science of love". In the impudent sleeping chamber scene, where Makaranda, dressed as Mālatī, the bride, lies on the bed and listens to what his beloved Madayantikā says about him in the conversation with her friend, who narrates as to how she dreams about her lover, how he approaches her violently in the dream, and how she is hardly able to retort to his violent solicitations in her burning amorous rapture,—and, Makaranda, who is very much glad, uncovers his face and rejoices the friendly services rendered by the god of love.

Further Bhavabhūti is able to find forceful expressions also for describing the feeling of excessive pain. In act IX we find Mādhava mad with grief in his bereavement from his beloved who is believed to be dead. He bursts into violent bewailings and turns towards the animals of the forest and the clouds in the sky in the belief that they must be sympathetic towards him in his grief. Thus he has certainly followed Kālidāsa's Meghadūta and Vikramorvaśīya. But we meat with real Bhavabhūtī when Mādhava ends his grief in the following words :

dhigucchvasitavaiśasaṁ mama yaditthamekākino
dhigeva ramaṇīyavastvananubhavād vṛthābhāvinaḥ I
tvayā saha na yastayā ca divasaḥ sa vidhvaṁsatāṁ
pramodamṛgatṛṣṇikāṁ dhigaparatra kāmānuṣe II

"Fie on the grief that has come to me and to me all alone; fie on the beautiful thing that you cannot rejoice and so has become devoid of any use; but the day that is

1. The stanza, that is in Sanskrit, occurs in the midst of a Prākrit dialogue. On Bhavabhūti's knowledge of Kāmaśāstra see aso Peterson, JBRAS 18, 1891, 109 ff.

not spent in your company is wasted, fie on the mirage of pleasure that you do not rejoice[1]".

Bhavabhūti has special fascination for strong contrasts. In act V he describes with high perfection the terrible movements of the witches and goblins in the grave-yards and the terrible tantric rites performed for worshipping the goddess Durgā, who asks for a human head. A real masterpiece is, notwithstanding long compounds, the description of the dance of the terrible goddess Cāmuṇḍā (Durgā) with her many arms, decorated with snakes and her frightful head performed for the entertainment of Śiva. It has been rightly said that this act V far surpasses the witch-scene in the "Macbeth" and the Walpurgis Night in the "Faust" in respect of horribleness and vividness and is of importance for history of religion[2]".

Although many of the scenes of the Mālatīmādhava are so dramatic, still this work of Bhavabhūti is merely a book-drama. It is since hardly thinkable that an audience, not consisting purely of first rate scholars of Sanskrit, could ever have understood the work merely by hearing it. The language of poetry is highly elegant. The very large number of model examples, quoted from the works of Bhavabhūti, that we find in manuals of poetics, prove the extent to which his dramas have been considered as pieces of classical ornate poetry.

The Veṇīsaṁhāra, "the Drama of Binding of the Lock"[3], of Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa[4] is another drama that is much quoted in manuals of rhetorics[5].

The plot of the drama is taken from the Mahābhārata-story of the ambassadorship of Kṛṣṇa till upto the fall of Duryodhana in the mace-fight with Bhīma[6]. Draupadī who

1. According to the German transl. of Fritze.

2. Cf. Fraser, Literary History of India, 288 ff.

3. Edited by J. Grill, Leipzig 1871, and with the commentary of Jagaddhara by K. P. Parab and K. R. Māḍgāvkar, Bombay, 1898, 2nd ed. 1905, NSP. An independent work, rather than a trans., is the work of Sourindro Mohun Tagore (Calcutta 1880), who boasts to be a descendant of this poet.

4. According to the prelude he had assumed also the epithet Mṛgarāja (i.e. siṁha). On his age see above p. 53.

5. Thus by Vāmana, Ānandavardhana, Ruyyaka, Nami, Kṣemendra, as well as in the Kāvyaprakāśa and in the Daśarūpa.

6. Mahābhārata V, 72, IX, 58.

is dragged by her hairs in the hall, is carrying her hairs loose and will not fasten them till after the humiliation suffered by her is avenged. Bhīma takes the vow that he will fasten her hairs with his hands coloured in the blood of Duryodhana. This takes places in act IV, in which Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīma indulge in most highly unusual joke with Draupadī.

Most of the occurrences that take place in course of the war are just narrated, indeed in a blossoming kāvya-style, but with unreal pathos, in which the force of the old epic is not visible. The happy, almost severe, conclusion stands in incompatible contrast to the tragic end of the great war. The popularity of the drama among the paṇḍitas is possibly based on its language alone and not on the subject-matter. However, the Indian rhetoricians have acknowledged the defects of this drama[1].

The Later Dramatic Literature

Rājaśekhara[2] too is included among the most eminent dramatists. He boasts to have amongst his fore-fathers a succession of famous poets[3] and he is proud in respect of his knowledge of language. In fact he is not a master of Sanskrit and Prākrit only, but also of popular languages, as is evident from many rare words and provincialisms used by him. He shows extraordinary skill in the use of ornate metres. Here and there he also employs the rhyme borrowed from popular poetry. At the same time he shows great predilection for proverbs and proverbial expressions. However, he is not a first rate poet. Probably he lacks in taste as well as in originality in addition.

Two of his dramas deal with epic materials. His Bālarāmāyaṇa or "the Rāmāyaṇa for Boys"[4], that narrates the whole story of the Rāmāyaṇa in ten long acts

1. Cf. Kāvyaprakāśa 7, 60 ff. and Sāhityadarpaṇa 406 ff. [But even the Daśarūpa and the Sāhityadarpaṇa are unable to find as proper illustrations of the garbha- and vimarṣa-saṁdhis from the Veṇīs., as from the Ratnāvalī, for instance"—S. K. D e, HSL, p. 274, foot-note.].

2. See above p. 53f. He is cited in the commentary on the Daśarūpa in Bhoja's Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa by Ruyyaka, Kṣemendra, Abhinavagupta and in Somadeva's Yaśastilaka.

3. He names Akālajalada, Surānanda, Tarala and Kavirāja.

4. Published in Pandit, Vol. III,[also edited by Govindadeva Śāstrī, Vārāṇasī 1869, Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta 1884.].

(with 741 stanzas) is based not only on Vālmīki, but also on Bhavabhūti. Following the model of Harṣadeva and Bhavabhūti he has inserted a drama within a drama in act III, and the act V is a tasteless imitation of act IV of Kālidāsa's Vikramorvaśīya. The Bālabhārata or "the Mahābhārata for Boys", also called Pracaṇḍapāṇḍava, "the Drama of Haughty Pāṇḍavas[1]" has not come down to us in a complete form: may be, the poet left it incomplete or its first two acts are lost for ever. The first one describes the marriage of the Pāṇḍavas and the second one describes the game of dice and its consequences till upto the banishment of the Pāṇḍavas into the forest.

In his two nāṭikās, the Viddhaśālabhañjikā" "the Statue[2]" and the Karpūramañjarī[3], that deviate little from their models provided in Kālidāsa's Mālavikāgnimitra and Harṣadeva's Ratnāvalī, Rājaśekhara is not very ingenuous. Notwithstanding this, the Viddhaśālabhañjikā is not wanting in comic situations, that find abundant number of occasions, in addition to the fact that the heroine is a boy dressed as a girl.

In contrast to this, the Karpūramañjarī is more significant and more original. It is one of the best comic plays of Indian literature. It is the only available comedy that is wholly in Prākrit[4]. It is often said that it is either the poet's first work or a work written at a time when he had not attained maturity—a statement that seems to be without basis. On the other hand, we are able to conclude from the remarks in the prelude that after Rājaśekhara had attained fame as a Sanskrit poet, he wanted

1. Edited by C. Cappeller, Strassburg 1885 and Km. 4, 1887. Cf. Weber, Ind Stud. 18, 481 ff. Three verses have been borrowed from the Mahābhārata ad verbatim. Probably the work consisted of ten acts or it originally had the same volume.

2. Edited with a commentary in the Pandit, Vol. VI; [with the commentary of Vāmanācārya] by B. R. Arte, Poona 1886. English transl. by L. H. Gray, JAOS 27, 1906, 1ff.

3. Edited in the Pandit, Vol. VII, with the commentary of Vāsudeva in Km. 4, 1887 and critically edited by Sten Konow, in addition to an English translation by Ch. R. Lanman in HOS. Vol. IV, Cambridge, Mass. 1901. [Ed. Manomohan Ghosh, Calcutta 1939].

4. The technical expression for this type of drama is saṭṭaka. Rudradāsa's Candralekhā, ed. by A. N. Upadhye, Bombay 1945, is another saṭṭaka, that also is wholly in Prākrit.

to prove by writing this that he was able to employ the most complicated metres in Prākrit as in Sanskrit. But he seems to have made use of not only the popular Prākrit, but appears to have been otherwise dependent also upon popular plays. Many a time the somewhat naked humour and the character of the song-play that appears in occasional songs are vulgar.

Witty, but at the same time also blunt, is in act I the dialogue between the vidūṣaka, who boasts of being a scholar, since the father-in-law of his father-in-law used to carry books to the houses of his neighbours, and the highly gifted maid-servant, who recited her poems in the presence of the king and the queen, who praise her. This makes the Brāhmaṇa very angry and vindictive. The entry of the wizard and the tāntrika priest Bhairavānanda, who very nicely caricatures the religion of the Śāktas with his filthy eloquence, is described with blunt humour. A little intoxicated, he, in rhyming four-lined stanzas, praises the majestic religion of the Kaulas, for whom neither book nor word nor meditation is necessary for the purpose of attaining salvation, but only wine, woman and meat. Then he boasts swaggeringly at the efficacy of his magic with which he can bring down the moon upon the earth, can stop the chariot of the sun, can make gods visible etc. The king expresses the desire that he should make a beautiful woman appear. And at once there appears a wonderful girl for enchanting the king. The girl is Karpūramañjarī, the heroine of the drama, and the king immediately falls in love with her. The further treatment runs almost according to the model of Mālavikāgnimitra. In any case, new is the scene of the swing-festival, celebrated in honour of Gaurī, in which a beautiful maid sports on the swing before a picture of the goddess, and the king gets an opportunity to see his beloved again. The songs

5. So V. Sh. Apte, Rājaśekhara. His life and writings, p. 22ff. and Konow. ibid p. 184.

In the prelude it is said that the difference between a rough unadulterated Sanskrit poem and a fine Prākrit poem is similar to that existing between a man and a woman. The drama written in "effeminate" Prākrit was (according to the prelude) staged at the desire of Avantisundarī, the wife of the poet.

in which the swinging of the beautiful young girls is described are really master pieces of syllabic decoration with alliterations and internal rhymings that in an excellent manner give expression to the peaceful to-and-fro movement of the girl in the swing. In act IV too we have the description of a popular feast, that is of vaṭasāvitrī, and in it takes place the mask-dance, that is exacting and interesting at the same time.

If we take the works of Rājaśekhara as a whole, we are in agreement with the opinion of Pischel[1] who says: "Rājaśekhara was a master of language and his dramas are extremely important for knowledge of Sanskrit and rather of Prākrit. His verses are elegant and flowing, and in his terribly dull and tedious Bālarāmāyaṇa one comes across many scenes that, on account of their nicely sounding stanzas and idiomatic phrases and allusions to the manners and customs, are not devoid of interest and pleasure. But as a dramatist Rājaśekhara's position is not high."

With Bhavabhūti the line of great dramatists in Indian literature comes to an end. Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa and Rājaśekhara already belong to the category of imitators. This imitative literature, however, has not come to its real end even upto this day. Down upto our days new dramas, following old models have been and are being composed. The old traditional stories have throughout supplied the themes for the recent dramas. In this connection the Rāma-tale stands in the front line[2].

One of the dramas that on account of its style and language is much esteemed by Indian paṇḍitas is the Anargha-

1. GGA 1883, 1227 f.

2. On the Rāma-dramas see Lévi, 267 ff. and Bhaṭṭanātha Svāmin, Ind Ant. 41, 1912, 139 ff. King. Yaśovarman's Rāmābhyudaya (quoted in Dhvanyāloka and in the commentary on the Daśarūpa) and Māyurāja's Uddāttarāghava (quoted in the commentary on the Daśarūpa) have not come down to us.

[His work has been cited in the Daśarūpa II, 58; III, 3, 24 (under the name of its author); IV, 13, 28. It was known also to Abhinavagupta (in his commentary on Bharata, XIX) and to Kuntaka (Ed. S. K. De, Calcutta 1928, pp. 225, 244.)] On Rama-dramas see also Konow, Ind. Drama p. 96 ff. [Other Rāma- dramas mentioned by Abhinavagupta in his commentary on Bharata and Kuntaka. They are of unknown dates and of unknown authors in most cases. Their names are :—Chalitarāma, Kṛtyārāvaṇa and Māyāpuṣpaka. Cf. S. K. De, HSL, p. 301.]

rāghava[1] of the poet Murāri, who may have lived in between 1050 and 1135 A. D.[2] The Unmattarāghava "(the Drama of the Angry Son of Raghu)"[3], (called prekṣāṇaka) of Bhāskarabhaṭṭa is a soliloquy of angry Rāma after the sudden disappearance of Sītā, in imitation of Vikramorvaśīya. Very much esteemed by Indians is the Prasannarāghava[4] of Jayadeva, the son of Mahādeva of Kauṇḍinyagotra. In the first-half of the 17th century Mahādeva, a disciple of Bālakṛṣṇa (who in 1637 wrote one Nīlakaṇṭhavijayacampū (in 1636 A.D.) wrote the Adbhutadarpaṇa[5] in ten acts, in which the original story of Rāma is hardly recognisable. In about the same period South Indian Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita, a disciple of Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkṣita wrote his drama Jānakīpariṇaya," "The Marriage of Sītā"[6], likewise with stronger deviations from Vālmīki's poem.

1. Edited [by Premachandra Tarkavāgīśa, Calcutta 1860 and] with the commentary of Rucipati in Km. 5, 1887. Extracts in Wilson II, 375 ff.

2. So according to Bhaṭṭanātha Svāmin, ibid; whilst Durgāprasāda places him the middle of the 9th century A. D. Maṅkha and Ruyyaka knew Murāri. He calls himself a son of Tantumatī and of Varddhamānabhaṭṭa, and in several places he is called "Bālavālmīki". The drama is often called "Murārināṭaka". Konow, Indische Dramen, p. 83 considers Murāri as older. ["The earliest citation from the Anargharāghava occurs in the Daśarūpaka II 1 (rāma rāma...=Anargha. III, 21). Therefore, it may be justifiable to place Murāri at the end of the 9th century and in the beginning of the 10th century. The position is not invalidated on account of occurrence of the verse in the Mahānāṭaka, "which is notorious for its appropriation of stanzas from most of the Rāma-dramas : cf. S. K. De, HSL, p. 449.]

3. Edited in Km. 17, 1889. According to the prelude the drama was staged before an assembly of learned men, who had gathered for honouring Vidyāraṇya. In case this Vidyāraṇya be identical with Mādhava, the brother of Sāyaṇa, the drama would be attributed to the 14th century.

4. Edited [by Govindadeva Śāstrī, Varanasi 1868) in the Pandit, Vol. II, and a commentary thereupon by Gaṅgānātha in the Pandit N. S. Vol. 26-28. It is quoted in the Sāhityadarpaṇa, see Bhaṭṭanātha Svāmin, ibid 143 note (edition also by S. M. Paranjape and N. S. Panse, Poona 1894 and K. P. Parab, NSP; 1893 and again 1914.) The age of the work is not definite, but "probably it was written in the 13th century"; cf. S. K. De, Sanskrit Poetics, p. 215 f. and HSL. p. 462.) In about 1390 Maṇika in Nepal wrote a drama Abhinavarāghava (Lévi 268) and in about 1599 Sundaramiśra wrote a seven-act drama Abhirāmamaṇi (Wilson II, 395), that is also quoted frequently by the author in his Nāṭyapradīpa (see Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. III, p. 347 f.).

5. Ed. in Km. 55, 1906.

6. Edited in Km. 1894. Lévi 286 gives the contents of the seven acts. On the poet cf. T. S. Kuppuswami Śāstri, Ind. Ant. 33,

A most characteristic and literarily and historically most important of the Rāma-dramas is, however, "The Mahānāṭaka, "the Great Drama", that claims as it author, a personality not inferior to Hanumat, the monkey of the Rāmayaṇa-fame, and hence known also by the name Hanumannāṭaka. Since it has already been referred to by Ānandavardhana, its age cannot be later than 850 A.D. However, this work has come down to us in two recensions that seemingly differ strongly from one another. In course of time the volume of the drama has grown larger with interpolations to such an extent that in it we find passages from other Rāma-dramas, like those of Bhavabhūti, Rājeśekhara and Murāri. The difference is not only in respect of the number of verses, but also, in that of the acts in the manuscripts. The western recension, that is attributed to Dāmodaramiśra[1], has 581 stanzas in 14 acts, while in the Bengal recension[2], attributed to Madhusūdana, there are 730 stanzas in 9 acts. However, the division into acts is not important. The Mahānāṭaka is hardly a model drama, but something between epic and dramatic poetry. Like any proper epic, almost the entire work is full of metrical lines. We come across just occasionally short passages in prose and that only in a few unimportant places. The stanzas contain partly the dialogue and partly they simply narrate action in an epical fashion In place of stage-directions we find epical stanzas written in the kāvya-style. There is no dialogue in Prākrit, nor a vidūṣaka. In the beginning of the drama the stage-manager does not speak about the performance, but says, "I shall speak about the Rāmāyaṇa". Then he says also : "It appears that we are the lucky actors (*nartakāḥ*,

1904, 126 ff. 176 ff. [Ed. also by Lakṣmaṇa Sūri, Tanjore 1906. The same author wrote also one Śṛṅgāratilaka, (ed. Kedāranātha and Vāsudeva L. Panasīkara, NSP, 1910. In this drama the demons appear in the guises of Viśvāmitra, Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā in a curious manner and this results in confusion. It is of little dramatic value from the literary point of view.]

1. Published with the commentary of Mohanadāsa several times in India, so Bombay 1860, 1868 etc. [According S. K. De, HSL, p. 506 it has 548 verses.]

2. Edited (with the commenary) by Jībānanda Vidyāsāgara, 2nd Ed., Calcutta, 1890. [According to S. K. De, ibid, following Aufrecht, Bodl. Cat. p. 142 b, it has 720 verses. Edition also by Chandrakumāra Bhattāchārya with the commentary of Chandraśekhara Calcutta 1874.]

actually "dancers"), so it appears that the poem is meant to be recited by one person, while other silent actors will pantomimically represent the narrated events. Another presumption is that the piece was meant to be a Shadow-play[1].

Not only the two recensions deviate from one another, but likewise two different legends are current regarding the origin of this work. In Mohanadāsa's commentary on the Dāmodaramiśra-recension it has been said as follows:—The divine ape Hanumat, the battle-companion of Rāma, composed this drama and copied it on stone-slabs. Vālmīki feared that the charm of this poem would completely overshadow his Rāmāyaṇa. Since the monkey was generous and without egoism, he laughed at Vālmīki and threw into the ocean the stone-slabs on which he had written his drama. Several centuries later it so happened that certain parts of the poem were recovered and brought to King Bhoja, who entrusted to Dāmodaramiśra the task of bringing together the stray parts of the poem, to fill the lacunae and to make from them one unified work. But at the end of the recension of Madhusūdana it is said that this sublime Mahānāṭaka was composed by the higly well-known Hanumat and was recovered by Vikramāditya. To describe this the commentator says:—Once Hanumat wrote these verses on rocks and sunk them into sea-water. Vikramāditya, however, got them taken out with the help of fishermen[2].

1. So Pischel, SBA 1906, 498ff. and KG 179 f. and Luders, SBA 1916, 698 ff. Lüders, ibid 704 ff. does not consider it as certain that the smaller recension is also older, as we ordinarily assume. The statement of Max Müller (Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik 1846, p. 472ff.) that the Mahānāṭaka may be considered to be the first rudiment of the real drama, "the first experiment in the dramatic art..., of an age, when it began to be separated from the sphere of the epic, but had not" "still taken a status independent of it", does not appear as probable. [Konow Indische Dramen, p. 89 f, speaks with too much of confidence about the Mahānāṭaka as a shadow-play, although it is still a mere presumption.]

2. Edited in Km. 28, 1891; translated into English by L. H. Gray, JAOS 32, 1912, 58, ff. Cf. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat., p.1604, ff.; C. Bendall, JRAS 1898, 229 f; P. E. Pavolini, GSAI, 25, 1912, 315 ff.; Pischel, SBA 1906, 494 ff.; Lüders, SBA 1916, 698.

The hypothesis that the Mahānāṭaka was meant to be staged as a shadow-play finds support in the fact that it has great similarity with the text of the Javanese shadow-play and that Dūtāṅgada, "the Drama of Aṅgada's Errand"[1], of Subhaṭa, that is very similar to the Mahānāṭaka, is expressly called a shadow-play (chāyānāṭaka)[2]. This drama describes a single episode of the Rāmāyaṇa, namely the mission of Aṅgada, that proceeds the declaration of war against Rāvaṇa. The Dūtāṅgada too has come down to us in two recensions: one longer, the other shorter; but manuscripts greatly differ from one another throughout. In one of the recensions, not only the dialogues in verses but also narrative stanzas have been inserted, so much so that the work appears likewise as something intermediate between an epic and a drama. Subhaṭa himself admits to have brought into his work verses by other poets too, and a number of stanzas are borrowed from the Mahānāṭaka. The Dūtāṅgada was staged under an order of the Caulukya king Tribhuvanapāla of Gujarat on March 7 of the year 1243 during the spring-festival on the day of the swing-feast in honour of a picture of Śiva obtained by Kumārapāla[3].

The drama Gopālakelicandrikā ("Moonbeam of the Sports of the Cowherd"), that is to say that like the rays of the moon shines forth the sport of the cowherd

1. We are able to draw from these legends at least the chronological conclusion with regard to the manner in which from certain anecdotes literary works have got associated with King Vikramāditya or King Bhoja.

2. According to S. K. De, HSL, p. 507, "there is nothing in the work itself, in spite of irregularities, to show that the composition was intended or ever used for shadow-pictures." Continuing De, ibid, p. 509, says: —"All this presumption is perhaps more in keeping with the nature of the work and the period in which the recensions were redacted than the solution of an unwarranted show-play theory or superficial lese-drama explanation, [see also S. P. Bhattacharya, IHQ, 1934, p. 492 f.].

3. [Rajendralal Mitra, Bikaner Catalogue, p. 251, suggests that the drama is perhaps simply intended as an entr'acte.] There are yet other shadow-plays of still later ages. So Vyāsaśrī Rāmadeva wrote in the first-half of the 15th century A.D. the shadow-play Pāṇḍavābhyudaya, that describes the birth and marriage of Draupadī with the five sons of Pāṇḍu. Rāmābhyudaya ("Rāma's Rise") and Subhadrāpariṇayana ("Marriage of Subhadrā", Kṛṣṇa's sister, with Arjuna)". Cf. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat., p. 1602 ff. and Bendall, JRAS 1898, 231 and British Museum Catalogue No. 271. A wholly modern shadow-play is the Sāvitrīcarita in seven acts of Śaṅkaralāla that was printed in Bombay in 1882 and perhaps was written in that very year; see Lüders, ibid p. 699.

Kṛṣṇa[1]) of the poet Rāmakṛṣṇa, son of Devajīti of Gujarat[2]. It is written wholly in Sanskrit and is full of epical and lyrical stanzas that do not sound appropriate in the the mouth of appearing characters. Probably lyrical portions, as also communications in prose, are given seldom in the forms of the past tense of verbs, as is the case with narratives. They are intended to be addressed to the spectator by the reporter (sūcaka)—so is called once the stage-manager. Metrical descriptions and narrations in the kāvya-style often take the place of stage-directions.

In its contents the Gopālakelicandrikā is partly idyllic and partly mystic. Charming scenes from pastoral life, in which Kṛṣṇa with his conveyance and his beloved Rādhā with her friend enter, are sometimes extended by songs and sometimes by dialogues. Humour too is not wanting. Jayanta, a cowherd, is the comic figure who enters in the scenes, full of mirth[3]. On the other hand, the religious and mythical background are appropriately brought to light. It is clearly stated that this drama is to be staged in some festival congregation of the bhaktas, the faithful devotees of Kṛṣṇa. It is also pointed out from time to time that Rādhā is the śakti of Kṛṣṇa, that really both of them are one and that Kṛṣṇa is the Best of being (Puruṣottama), who has come upon the earth in the form of a cowherd (gopāla). As in the Gītagovinda, so here too, Kṛṣṇa is often mentioned as "forest-garlanded" (vanamālī). But this pastoral play has otherwise little of common with the Gītagovinda. The latter is more a lyric than a dramatic poem; while the Gopālakelicandrikā is something between an epic and a drama, like the Mahānāṭaka. Like the latter, it is probably meant for recitation. Silent actors, perhaps children, have to combine recitation with gesture in music and dance.

1. Een onbekend Indish tooneelstuck (Gopālakelicandrikā). Tekst met inleiding door W. Caland. (Verh. der kon. Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afd. Lett. N. R. Deel XVII, No. 3) Amsterdam 1917. Cf. Hertel, LZB 1917, p. 1198 ff. Winternitz, ZDMG 74, 1920, p. 137 ff. See also Keith in BSOS, 1917, p. 126 ff. and Konow, Ind. Ant. 49. 1920, 232 ff.

2. About the age of the author we simply know that he knew the Mahānāṭaka and the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and that he lived after Rāmānuja (12th century A.D.).

3. He is, however, essentially different from the Vidūṣaka of the classical dramas.

Bhāsa's Bālacarita goes to prove that the Kṛṣṇa-legend was dramatised in an already earlier age. But we do not possess any of the Kṛṣṇa-dramas of the golden age of Indian dramaturgy. Like the Gopālakelicandrikā, that belongs to a post-Rāmānuja age, there are other dramas of later periods that are based on the Kṛṣṇa-legends. In about the 15th century Mathurādāsa depicted the life of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā in a small drama (nāṭikā) Vṛṣabhānujā[1]. Caitanya, who appeared as an incarnation of God Kṛṣṇa in the 16th century, seems to have commanded his disciples to adopt theatre as an instrument for popaganda. Rūpa Gosvāmin, his follower, wrote for glorification of Kṛṣṇa the two dramas, the Lalitamādhava (in 10 acts) and the Vidagdhamādhava (in 7 acts)[2] and one bhāṇa Dānakelikaumudī[3]. In the 16th century, the scholar Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa, son of Nṛsiṁha, too wrote a drama Kaṁsavadha[4] in seven acts, that narrates the story of killing of Kaṁsa by Kṛṣṇa and the preceding events according to book X of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa[5]. The drama Pradyumnābhyudaya[6] of the Keral king Ravivarman (Born in 1265 A.D.), that depicts the victory of Pradyumna, son of Kṛṣṇa, over Vajranābha, the lord of the daityas, belongs to the legendary region of Kṛṣṇa[7].

1. Edited in the Pandit, Vols. III-IV, and in Km. 46, 1895.

2. Edited with a commentary in Km. 81, 1903. It was written in 1533 A.D. Cf. Wilson II, 393 f.; Lévi 237 ff.; Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1592 f; Nilmani Chakravarti, JASB, N.S. 3, 1907, p. 210. [All these works were printed in the Bengali script at Berhampur, Murshidabad, respectively in 1924 and 1902. See S. K. De Introduction to Padyāvalī, Dacca 1934 and HSL, p. 468].

3. Composed in 1509 A.D. according to Rājendralāla Mitra, Notices of Sanskrit MSS. 3278.

4. Edited in Km. 6, 1888, Cf. Wilson II, 400 f.; Lévi 237; Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1591. [The author lived in the time of Akbar and wrote the work for a son of Todara Malla—S. K. De HSL p. 468 f.]

5. The Śrīdāmacarita of Sāmarāja Dīkṣita too treats a topic selected from book X of the Bhāgavata, see Wilson II, 404 ff. [On Kṛṣṇa-dramas, see Sten Konow, ibid p. 99.]

6. Ed. in TSS No. VIII. On the author see Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. 4, 145 ff.

7. The same topic, according to the same source (Harivaṁśa, chap. 150 ff.), is treated by Śaṁkara Dīkṣita, son of Bālakṛṣṇa Dīkṣita, in the drama Pradyumnavijaya, that was written in the first half of the 18th century (see Wilson II, 402 f.). In the same century Prince Rāmavarman of Kerala, who lived from 1755 till 1787 A.D., wrote his drama Rukmiṇīpariṇaya, edited in Km. 40, 1894, that depicts the marriage of Kṛṣṇa with Rukmiṇī.

Individual episodes from the Mahābhārata have often been the subject-matter of dramatic treatment. Thus Kulaśekharavarman, the king-poet of Kerala (between the second-half of the 10th and first-half of the 12th centuries A.D.) wrote the dramas Tāpatīsaṁvaraṇa in 6 acts and Subhadrādhanañjaya in 5 acts[1]. The first one treats of the story of the Kuru-king Saṁvaraṇa, who fell in love with Tāpatī, the daughter of the sun-god. She, with the help of the Ṛṣi Vaśiṣṭha, enjoyed the love of her sweet'heart for twelve years. "It is rather a narrative in a loose dramatic form of six acts, utilising the conventional devices of the vision of the beloved in dream, meeting of lovers in the course of a royal hunt, the inevitable longing and sentimentalities, union, abduction and final reunion, with plenty of supernatural and marvellous incidents[2]." The second drama describes how Dhanañjaya (i.e. Arjuna) obtained Subhadrā, the sister of Kṛṣṇa[3]. In the vyāyoga Dhanañjayavijaya[4], the poet Kāñcana, son of Nārāyaṇa, describes the recovery by Arjuna of the cows stolen away by Karṇa, as in the Virāṭaparvan of the Mahābhārata. A poet Rudradeva wrote the drama Yayāticarita[5] in 7 acts that narrates the story of Yayāti and Śarmiṣṭhā follow-

1. The two dramas with the commentary [of Śivarāma] have been edited in TSS Nos. 11 and 13, 1911, 1912 by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. The age of these two dramas in the opinion of K. Rama Pisharoti (IHQ) VII, p. 319ff. is the end of the 7th and beginning of the 8th century A.D. The story of kidnapping of Subhadrā is narrated also in the one - act play Subhadrāharaṇa of Mādhava Bhaṭṭa (edited in Km. 9, 1888); a MS of this drama is dated 1610 A. D.

2. [S. K. De HSL, p. 466.]

3. Mahābhārata, I, 171 ff.; 219 ff. The Subhadrāharaṇa is staged upto this day by the Cakkyaras, the native actors, on the Malabar coast (see K. Rāmavarma Rāja, JRAS 1910, 637).

4. Edited in Km. 54, 1895, Cf. Wilson II, 374; Lêvi 251 f. The drama was presented under an order of King Jayadeva (another reading Jagaddeva). One Jayadeva of Kanauj probably belongs to the 12th century A.D. according to Wilson. Duff 285 mentions only one Jayacandra (about 1170 A.D.) in the list of Kanauj-rulers. In about 1286 A.D. there was one Jayadeva ruling in Kāntipura and Lalitapaṭṭana and one Jagaddeva was ruling in Paṭṭi - Pombucchapura in the beginning of the 12th century A.D. (see Duff 117, 140, 206).

5. Wilson II, 388 f. According to Krishnamacharya 103 the author might have been identical with Pratāparudradeva, of Oraṅgal, who ruled from 1268 to 1319.A.D. However, very frequently the name occurs as Rudradeva.

ing the Mahābhārata (I, 78 ff) ends with the union of the pair and appeasement of the queen Devayānī. The rhetorician Viśvanātha (c., 1316 A.D.) wrote the vyāyoga Saugandhikāharaṇa[1]. The drama has only one scene of 145 stanzas and contains a dialogue between Hanumat and Bhīma, who is in search of a lotus-flower desired by Draupadī[2].

More seldom than Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, god Śiva appears in dramatic poetry. To the poet Bāṇa, the court-poet of Harṣadeva, is attributed a drama the Pārvatīpāriṇaya, "Marriage of Pārvatī"[3]. In almost a slavish fashion the author narrates the story of the Kumārasaṁbhava - the word "narrates" has been used, since nothing is remarkable in the whole drama. The five tiresome acts describe how Kāma, the god of love, is reduced to ashes and Pārvatī becomes the consort of Śiva. In this drama we do not find any trace of originality or of any of the requirements that Bāṇa, in the introduction to his Harṣacarita, lays down for the poets. This deficiency and the fact that it has not been referred to in any text-book of poetics strongly support the view that it was not written by Bāṇa of the 7th century A.D., but its authorship goes to some young poet, who made himself known as "New Bāṇa", perhaps to Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa, who lived in the 15th century A.D. and belonged to the same Vatsa-gotra, in which the older Bāṇa was born, and who, many a time, is also designated as "the new Bāṇa[4]."

The same position holds good also for the ḍima-type of drama, the Manmathonmathana, "The Destruction of

1. Ed. in Km. 74, 1902. The drama calls itself a prekṣaṇaka, but Viśvanātha in his Sāhityadarpaṇa (514) has mentioned it as an example of vyāyoga.

2. Mahābhārata, 3, 146. f.

3. Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa's Pārvatīpariṇayanāṭakam, critically edited by R. Schmidt, AKM XIII, 4, Leipzig 1917. Cf. K. T. Telang, Ind. Ant. 3, 1874, 219 ff.; K. Glaser, Über Bāṇas Pārvatīpariṇayanāṭaka, SWA 1883; Pārvatis Hochzeit translated into German by K. Glaser (Separ. from the Jahresbericht des Staatsgymnasiums in Triest for the year 1886), Triest (1886; R. Schmidt, Ind. Ant. 35, 1906, 215 f. ; Über die Srīrangam 1903 erschiene Ausgabe von R. V. Krishnamachariar, who at first of all, attributed the work to Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa); Krishnamacharya, 91; Winternitz, DLZ 1918, p. 470 ff. A comparison of Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa's Śṛṅgārabhūṣaṇa with the Pārvatībhūṣaṇa rather supports the hypothesis that this was written by a third Bāṇa. On this and other Śiva-dramas see Konow, ibid p. 103 f.

4. See also p. 293.

Love-god", of a poet R ā m a of the Kauśikāyana-family and of an unknown age[1].

The well-known legend of king Hariścandra, famous for his benevolence and truthfulness, taken from the M ā r k a ṇ ḍ e y a - p u r ā ṇ a, has provided a favourite theme to later-day drama writers. In the five-act drama C a ṇ ḍ a k a u ś i k a, "Drama of Terrible Kauśika[2]", the poet K ṣ e m ī ś v a r a[3] has handled this story. It is a seriously gloomy piece; and the scenes, in which are described the awe and horror of a funeral place and the bloody cult of the horrible goddess Kātyāyani have been depicted, remind us of the Mālatīmādhava. The force of language and of pathos as well as the difficult kāvya-style with long compound words, to some extent, remind us of Bhavabhūti, upto whom Kṣemīśvara, however, could not reach. The legend was once more in the 12th century A.D. handled by the poet R ā m a c a n d r a, the disciple of H e m a c a n d r a, in his S a t y a h a r i ś c a n d r a, "Drama of Truth-loving Hariścandra"[4].

A versatile drama-writer, who worked on different types of dramatic poetry was V a t s a r ā j a, the minister of King Paramardideva (1163-1203). He lived further under his successor Trailokyavarmadeva, whose inscriptions are dated

1. Edited with a table of contents by R. S c h m i d t, ZDMG 63, 1909, 409 ff.; 629 ff. Perhaps it was written just in the year 1820 A.D. and is preserved in a single MS.

2 Edited with a commentary by J i b a n a n d a Vidyasagara, Calcutta 1884. Translated into German by L. F r i t ze (Reclams. Univ.-Bibl. 1926). Cf. P i s c h e l, GGA 1883, p. 1217 ff. Kauśika is the family-name of Sage Viśvāmitra, see above I, p. 468 f.; trans. 560 ff.

3. He is called K ṣ e m e n d r a too; but he is different from the Kashmirean poet of the same name. He is the author also of one N a i ṣ a d h ā n a n d a n ā ṭ a k a, from which P e t e r s o n, 3 Reports, p. 340 ff. has given extracts. The C a ṇ ḍ a k a u ś i k a is mentioned first of all in the Sāhityadarpaṇa. We are not in a position to decide whether Mahīpāla, under whose patronage this drama was staged according to the prelude, is the same prince, in whose court Rājaśekhara presented his Bālabhārata on the stage, and who ruled in about 910-940 A.D.—that is the opinion of P i s c h e l — or he, as K r i s h n a m a c h a r y a, p. 100 believes, is identical with Mahipāla Bhuvanaikamalla, of whom we possess a panegyric inscription dated 1093 A. D. in a temple in the Gwalior Fort (See K i e l h o r n, Ind. Ant. 15, 33 ff.)

4. Translated into Italian by M. V a l l a u r i, Firence 1913. Popular adaptations of the Hariścandra - legend in the popular languages of India are not seldom. One such Hariścandranṛtyam, an old Nepalese dance-play, has been edited by A. C o n r a d y, Leipzig, 1891; Cf. F r i t z e's translation, p. 9; J a c k s o n JAOS, 23, 1902, 317.

between 1212 and 1241 A.D. He is the author of a vyāyoga K i r ā t ā r j u n ī y a , in which is narrated the same tale as in Bhāravi's epic bearing the same title. He wrote also one īhāmṛga R u k m i ṇ ī h a r a ṇ a, a ḍima T r i p u r a d ā h a, a samavakāra S a m u d r a m a n t h a n a , a bhāṇa K a r p ū r a c a r i t r a and a prahasana H ā s y a c ū ḍ ā m a ṇ i[1]. The vyāyoga P ā r t h a p a r ā k r a m a of Paramāra P r a h l ā d a n a d e v a , whose brother Dhārāvarṣa ruled in Gujarat between 1163 and 1208, depicts the cattle-robbery from the Virāṭaparvan of the Mahābhārata[2].

Occasionally historical characters too have been made heroes of dramas. So is the hero of the drama K a r ṇ a s u n d a r ī (nāṭikā)[3] of the Kashmirean poet B i l h a ṇ a , the Cālukya prince A ṇ h i l a v ā ḍ K a r ṇ a , son of Bhīmadeva, who ruled from 1064 to 1074 A. D. The drama was performed in the temple of Śāntinātha on the occasion of the festival of Jina Ṛṣabha in Aṇhilvāḍ and describes, after the model of the Ratnāvalī, the secret love of the prince with a Vidyādharī-princess.

There have been also poets, who have composed dramas for the glorification of living rulers, and these dramas, therefore, can outright be taken as p r a ś a s t i s in a dramatic form. And like the epics these dramatic praśastis too are sometime carved on stones. Thus in a mosque in Ajmer (Rajputana) have been discovered two on two basalt-plates, on which extracts from the second drama are engraved. That one of these dramas is L a l i t a v i g r a h a r ā j a n ā ṭ i k ā of a poet S o m a d e v a , who composed it for glorification of his patron Vigraharāja IV of Ajmer. The second one is the H a r a k e l i n ā ṭ a k a that is dated 1153 A.D. and was written by King V i g r a h a r ā j a himself. This drama contributes towards glorification of Śiva. Here a ruler, who is also poet, has left evidence of his poetical genious engraved on stones simply to make sure

1. The six dramas have been edited in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. VIII. 1918.

2. The drama has been edited in the Gaekwad's Or. Ser. No. IV, 1917: see H u l t z s c h , NGGW 1921, 37 ff.

3. Edited Km. 7, 1888. Cf. B ü h l e r , Hemachandra, p. 83. [On Bilhaṇa's K a r ṇ a s u n d a r ī (Ed. Km. 1888) ; see K o n o w, Indische Dramen, p. 112; K i e t h , SD, p. 256. The age of the work is given as about A D. 1080-90].

that through this it may come down to posterity. He could not of his own accord presume that later Mohammadan conquerors would be so unscrupulous that they would use these stones to serve as pillars in a mosque[1]. Another inscriptionally preserved drama, that too calls itself a praśasti, is the Pārijātamañjarī (or Vijayaśrī) nāṭikā of a poet Madana, with the epithet Bālasarasvatī. It was composed in honour of King Arjunadeva, one of the successors of King Bhoja of Dhārā, in the 13th century A.D.[2] The prelude begins with the verse...

atha kathaṁcidalikhite śrutilekhyaṁ likhyate śilāyugale ।
bhojasyaiva guṇorjitamarjunamūrtyāvatīrṇasya ॥

"On these two stone-blocks ... the might of the virtuous Bhoja himself, who has appeared in the body of Arjunavarman, is written". The heroine Pārijātamañjarī, the daughter of the Caulukya king of Gujarat, that was conquered by Arjunavarman, has become the actual queen. The poet appears to have followed the Ratnāvalī as his model. A panegyrical drama, written in about 1310 A.D. for glorification of a living ruler, is the Pratāparudrakalyāṇa or Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣaṇa, that was included by Vidyānātha in his manual of poetics[3]. The nine-act drama Gaṅgādāsapratāpavilāsa

1. The two plates were discovered during the year 1875-76 from the polished basalts in course of a repair of the mosque and were published by F. Kielhorn (Ind. Ant. 20, 201 ff., NGGW 1893, 552 ff. and "Bruchstücke indischer Schauspiele in Inschriften zu Ajmere," Sonderabdruck aus der Festschrift zur Feier des 150 Jährigen Bestehens der Koen. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen 1901, Berlin 1901). On the Prākrit of this drama, see Konow, GGA 1894 479 ff.

2. The first report about this dramatic praśasti (only the first two acts are preserved; the second slab of stone, that contained the remaining two acts is lost) was given by K. K. Lele in the year 1903. It has been edited and published (Ep Ind. 8, 96), also separately on the basis of a proof-copy by E. Hultzsch under the title. The Pārijātamañjarī or Vijayaśrī, a nāṭikā, composed in about 1213 by Madana, Leipzig 1906; a commentary upon it by Lakṣmaṇasūri, Leipzig 1907. There are inscriptions of Arjuna varman of the years 1211, 1213 and 1215. A. D.

3. See above p. 28. As Lévi (App. 45 f.) says : the poet has succeeded in making a contemporary king the hero of his drama, without caring in the least to bring in any actual historical moment. [Pratāparudra was a ruler of Warangal, and his inscriptions are dated 1298—1314. A.D.—Keith HSL p. 293]. The Hammīramadamardana too of the Jaina poet Jayasiṁha is a quasi-historical drama. It describes how the pride of Hammīra i.e. of Amir Shikār or of the Sultan Ṣamsu-d-dunya (‡1235 A.D.) was shattered. Cf. also S R Bhandarkar, Report II, p. 16 ff. 72 ff. [This work, that was written between 1219 and 1229 A.D., has been published in the GOS, No 10, 1910.]

of Gaṅgādhara describes events from the life of King Gaṅgādāsa Bhūvallabha Pratāpadeva of Campakapura in Gujarāt. The act V was played in the court of Sultan Muhammad (1443-1451) of Ahmadābād[1].

We find also dramatic gnomic poetry in Indian Literature. The most famous amongst these dramas is the Prabodhacandrodaya, "Rise of the Moon of Knowledge[2]" of Kṛṣṇamiśra, son of Viṣṇu. He wrote it for King Kīrtivarman of Chandella, who ruled between 1050 and 1116 A.D.[3]. As in the case of the oldest Buddhist dramas, (see above p. 119) here too almost all the appearing characters are abstract notions.

> From the union of God Śiva (Iśvara) with Illusion (Māyā) there is born the son mind (Manas). He has two wives: Activity (Pravṛtti) and Renunciation (Nivṛtti). From the first was born King Confusion (Moha) with his whole family and from the latter King Discrimination (Viveka) with his family. A very fierce battle, like the one between the Kauravas and Pāṇḍavas, breaks out between these two related families. A rumour is spread that a terrible female demon (Vidyā) will be born with the Moonrise of Knowledge (Prabodhacandrodaya[4]) from the union of King Discri-

1. Lévi, App. 46; Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat., p. 1608 ff.

2. Edited by H. Brockhaus, Lipsiae, 1835. Of the many Indian editions, the only one that can be recommended is that of Panasīkara Vūsudevaśarman, with two commentaries, 2nd. Ed.,- Bombay 1904, NSP. Translated into Germar (by Th. Goldstücker, whose name is not mentioned on the title-page) with a foreword by K. Rosenkrantz, Königsberg, 1842, also by B. Hirzel Zürich 1846. About translations into English, French, Dutch, Russian and new Indian languages, see in M. Schuyler, Bibliography, p. 64 ff. Cf. Schroeder ILC, 658 ff.; Lévi 229 ff.; Oldenberg, LAI, 282 f.

3. In its prelude the work mentions the defeat of Karna of Cedi (1042 A.D.). Hence it must have been written after the year 1042, see Hultzsch and Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. 1, 217 ff., 325; V. A. Smith, Ind. Ant. 37, 1908, 143. According to a tradition (Krishnamacharya p. 100 f.) Kṛṣṇamiśra was an ascetic of the Haṁsa-order, who instructed several young people for propagating the Advaita—philosophy. Among them was found one, who ridiculed philosophy as such and was devoted more to dramatic and erotic literature. In order to change the course of his mind Kṛṣṇamiśra composed this drama in which he taught philosophy in the guise of secular poetry.

4. Hence it is called also briefly Probodha (Knowledge), or Prabodhodaya (Rise of Knowledge) or Prabodhacandra (Moon of Knowledge).

mination (Viveka) with his wife Revelation (Upaniṣad), who will destroy the whole family of Confusion (Moha). Moha (Confusion) and his adherents obstruct this: his main followers are the Sexual Instinct (Kāma), his wife Sexual Pleasure (Rati), Spiritual Conceit (Brāhmaṇa Dambha) and his grandfather Egoism (Ahaṁkāra), Anger (Krodha) and Greed (Lobha) and his wives Injury (Hiṁsā) and Desire (Tṛṣṇā). The maid-servants of King Confusion are Wrong Knowledge (Mithyādṛṣṭi) and Bewilderment (Vibhramavatī). Among his reliable confederates are to be found Heterodox Learnings, particularly Materialism (Lokāyata) of Cārvāka. These mighty devils are opposed in the battle from the side of King Discrimination (Viveka), Peace (Śānti) and Compassion (Karuṇā), the daughters of Religion (Śraddhā), and their friends Love for Man (Maitrī) and Love for God (Viṣṇubhakti), too have joined hands. In the formidable battle, that is described in act V, the two troops of heroes, with their elephants, chargers and foot-soldiers push one another in a bloody arena. Materialism, that stands in the front row, is overthrown, so that the contestants get hold of each other. The heretic religions get scattered in the wind through the flood of the ocean of True Dharma. Buddhism takes shelter among the barbarious people, Digambara Jainism, Kāpālika Śaivism and other heretic teachings flee towards the regions of Pāñcālas Mālavas, Ābhīras etc., all infested with fools.

At the end Old Wisdom is victorious. The Revelation (Upaniṣad), through Divine Love (Viṣṇubhakti), becomes pregnant. From her womb are born a daughter, Science (Vidyā), and a son Rise of Knowledge (Prabodhodaya). A voice from behind the scene announces that the terrible Science (Vidyā) has burst forth the breast of the Mind (Manas) and that she has swallowed King Confusion (Moha) with his retinue. Immediately there appears Rise of Knowledge (Prabodhodaya) and greets

respectfully the Original Spirit (Puruṣa), who with pleasure takes him within his arms:

mohāndhakāramavadhūya vikalpanidrām
unmathya kopyajani bodhatuṣāraraśmiḥ ।
śraddhāvivekamatiśāntiyamādi yena
viṣṇvātmakaṁ sphurati viṣṇurahaṁ sa ekaḥ ॥

"Ah ! Removed is now the veil of
Darkness and it is morning;
He who dispels the darkness of Illusion,
The Night of doubt, he has torn asunder;
Born is the Rising of the Moon
Of knowledge, with the help of
Faith, Discrimination, Peace and Intellect.
In All is personified Viṣṇu—and I am that.
Through the grace the exalted Love for God
(Viṣṇubhakti) I am fully happy."

The explicit aim of the work, as we have already seen, is to glorify the orthodox Vedānta-theory from the point of view of the Vaiṣṇava cult in contrast to the heretic religious teachings. In case, however, one expects to find in this allegorical drama nothing but pedantic artificiality of a scholar, he will be agreeably surprised. He will be simply impressed also with real pieces of poetry in this work that does not lack in dramatically exciting handling. Here the characters are less stereotyped and more vividly sketched than in several other dramas: and—what should be probably most surprising—humour too comes into play. Although there is no vidūṣaka, in act III the priests of the heterodox sects are caricatured with blunt humour. Here a little probe from these scenes, that are of interest also from the point of view of history:—

Pity and Peace enter into talk with one another.
Suddenly Pity bursts forth : "Friend, a demon (*rākṣasa*), a demon !"
Peace:—"What a demon is there ?"
Pity:—"Look there, look there, friend !

He, who has no clothing, is carrying a feather from the tail of a peacock in his hand and has a terribly repulsive appearance on account of filth dripping from his body, is coming this way.

Peace:—Friend, He is not a demon; rather he is a weakling.

Pity:—Then what can he be ?

Peace:—I fear, he is a goblin (*piśāca*).

Pity:—Friend, how can a goblin dare come out when the world is brilliant with the net of the blazing rays of the sun ?

Peace:—Then possibly he is a creature of the hill that has come up from its den. (Marks him and pondering) (Ah, I have found out the truth). It is the Digambara-canon that has been set into motion by Confusion. Let us, therefore, leave him the passage wide open. (She turns about her face).

Pity:—Friend, wait a moment, till I look for Śraddhā in him. (So both of them stop. The Digambara Jaina appears in the guise of a Jaina monk.)

Digambara:—Hail to Arhats. Hail to Arhats. In the house with nine gates[1] the soul burns like a lamp. This is the emancipation- and bliss-bestowing highest truth uttered by the most exalted Jina. (Goes away). (From inside the stage) Hear, Hear, O young lay-men,

malamaapuggalapiṇḍe saalajalehiṁ kelisī suddhī ।
appā vimalasahāvo lisipalicalaṇehi jāṇavvo ॥

"How can the water of the whole world
Clean this body, the mass of filth ?
The soul, that by nature, is pure,
Can be known by no means,
That is different from devotion to sages."

What do you say ? What sort of devotion to sages ? Hear this—

dūle calaṇapaṇāmo kidasakkālaṁ ca bhoaṇaṁ miṭṭhaṁ ।
issāmalaṁ ṇa kijjaṁ lisiṇaṁ dālaṁ lamantāṇaṁ ॥

"Bow before the holy-men from a distance,
Extend them all hospitability and
A sweet dish, you must offer them :
While these holy-men be enjoying with your women,
Do avoid condemning them filthily."

1. That is in the bodv of human-being.

Soon there enters the Buddhist Canon in the guise of a monk, with a book in his hand. He recites a Buddhist stanza and praises his religion in the words:—

aho sādhurayaṁ saugato dharmo yatra saukhyaṁ mokṣaśca tathāhi ।
āvāso layanaṁ manoharamabhiprāyānukūlā vaṇiṅ-
nāryo vāñchitakālamiṣṭamaśanaṁ śayyā mṛduprastaraḥ ।
śraddhāpūrvamupāsikāyuvatibhiḥ kḷptāṅgadānotsava-
krīḍānandabharaṁ vrajanti vilasajjyotsnāṅkurā rātrayaḥ ॥

"How excellent is this Buddhist religion, in which both pleasure and emancipation can be had. Thus :

"(A Buddhist) has a pretty house for his abode;
Willing wives of traders remain at his command;
He is served with dainty dishes whenever he likes;
He is provided with a soft bed (to sleep upon);
Believing young beauties offer themselves for his pleasure;
He passes moon-lit nights in revellings and sports."

Pity:—Friend, who is coming there, the man, slim like a young palm-tree, with down-hanging brown mantel and a wholly shaven skull ?

Peace:—Friend, that is the Buddhist Canon. Monk (from inside the curtain): hear, O laymen and monks, hear the nectar of the word of the Buddha. (Reads from a book): I see with my divine eye the good and the evil of man. All things of this world are momentary. There is no eternal soul. Hence do not grow zealous of the monks meeting your wives. Zealousy is the name of sin.

It is followed by exchange of words between the Jaina and Buddhist monks. Each one of them declares his religion to be superior, and while doing this they ridicule each other in a most filthy manner. This scene reaches its climax with the entry of Tantricism in the garb of a Kāpālika.

Kāpālika (moving about):

narāsthimālākṛtacārubhūṣaṇaḥ
śmaśānavāsī nṛkapālabhojanaḥ ।
paśyāmi yogāñjanaśuddhacakṣuṣā
jaganmitho bhinnamabhinnamīśvarāt ॥

"My ornament is a garland of human-bones,

The funeral yard—my residence:
I take my food in a skull of man:
With my eye cleared through witchcraft,
I see the world and God,
Both as one and different."

The Jaina ascetic asks him as to the nature of his religion and its principles of emancipation. At this the Kāpīlaka describes the manner of his worship of God in the words:

mastiṣkāntravasābhighāritamahāmāṁsāhutīrjuhvatāṁ
vahnau brahmakapālakalpitasurāpānena naḥ pāraṇā ।
sadyaḥkṛttakaṭhorakaṇṭhavigalatkīlāladhārojjvalair
arcyo naḥ puruṣopahārabalibhirdevo mahābhairavaḥ ॥

"We offer to our God human-flesh mixed up with brain, marrow and fat in fire:
We break our fast with drink of wine kept in the skull of a Brāhmaṇa:
We worship the divine great Bhairava with offer of human-flesh,
Looking bright with the stream of blood flowing from the hard neck just severed."

Monk: (Listening attentively): O Buddha, Buddha ? What a terrific religious practice !

Jaina Ascetic: O Arhat, Arhat ! How much has this wretched fellow been under the influence of some devil ?

Then the Kāpālika angrily proceeds towards the two, since they have accused God Śiva of witchcraft and threatens them with his terrible sword. Overwhelmed with anxiety the monk and the ascetic yield before him and request him to pardon them. Then he puts back his sword into the sheath and takes upon himself the duty of propagating his religion wider. One cannot be happy without enjoyment of sensuous pleasure; without enjoyment there cannot be spiritual emancipation: an emancipated person should have the form of Śiva, who sports rejoicingly embraced by his loving wife Pārvatī. Since both of them doubt about the correctness of the principle that a being given to suffering can be emancipated, the Kāpālika summons his religion, that enters in the

guise of a Kāpālinī, resembling a voluptuous woman of lowly origin. The Kāpālika orders her to take hold of the two spirits. Now she embraces the monk and the Jaina ascetic one after another. These two persons give expression to their feeling of joy and quickly they get rid of their religion and embrace the religion of the Kāpālika, whom they recognise as their teacher and master and let themselves be initiated with the drink of wine into the great teaching of Bhairava—all this is described with severe humour, that is hardly to be met with in many places.

The great popularity of this allegorical drama among the paṇḍitas is proved not only by the large number of its extant manuscripts and printed editions, but also by the several imitations that it has found[1]. Thus in between 1229 and 1232 the Jaina Yaśaḥpāla wrote a drama Moharājaparājaya, the "Defeat of King of Illusion", in which the conversion to Jainism of King Kumārapāla and his marriage with the princess Kṛpāsundarī ("Generosity, the Beauty") are presented and Hemacandra is mentioned as the priest, who solemnises the marriage in the presence of the Arhat[2]. In the 13th or 14th century the Vedānta-scholar (Vedāntadeśika) Veṅkaṭanātha (or Veṅkaṭeśa)[4] wrote a philosophical drama, the Saṁkalpasūryodaya, "Rise of the Sun of Will" in 10 acts[4]. In the 16th century Kavi-karṇapūra (born 1525) wrote his allegorico-philosophical and quasi-

1. A paraphrase of the Prabodhacandrodaya is the Vijñānagītā, that was written after 1600 A.D. by the Hindi poet Keśavadāsamiśra (perhaps a descendant of Kṛṣṇamiśra); see Grierson, JRAS 1908, 1136ff.

2. Cf. Bühler, Hemacandra, p. 4, 32, 55, 81; Kielhorn, Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS in the Bombay Presidency 1880-81 Bombay 1881, No. 50. The drama Moharājapariṇaya has been edited in the Gaekwad Oriental Series. No. IX, 1918. In the same series have appeared other dramas written by Jainas. A particularly successful drama-writer was Rāmacandra, a disciple of Hemacandra. Cf. Hultzsch, NGGW 1921, p. 39 ff., and ZDMG 75, 1921, p. 61 ff. Rāmacandra wrote together with Gaṇacandra a commentary on the Nāṭyadarpaṇa, a work on dramaturgy. The Jainācarya Vijayadharmasūri had reported to W. that he possessed a MS of this work.

3. On the author and his large number of works see Aufrecht, CC II, 142 f.; III, 126 and Krishnamacharya p. 123 f.

4. Published with a commentary in Pandit N. S. Vols. 28-34. On a new edition of the Saṅkalpasūryodya (Srirangam 1917), see JRAS 1921, p.591.

historical drama Caitanyacandrodaya in 10 acts[1] at the command of King Pratāparudra. Kali ("Evil Age") and Adharma ("Disbelief") appear in this piece and complain that on account of the preachings of Caitanya their rule is losing force. Immediately Caitanya himself (as a demi-god) appears with his disciples for the purpose of propagating the right principles. By the side of the mythological and allegorical characters (Bhakti, Maitrī, Nārada, Kṛṣṇa, etc.) there appear also human beings like King Pratāparudra and others. A very learned work is also the drama Amṛtodaya[2] in 5 acts of Gokulanātha of Mithilā. It is attributed to the year 1693 A.D. Here characters like Śruti, Ānvīkṣakī, Kathā, Patañjali, Jābāli and others enter. In the first half of the 18th century Ānandarāya Makhin[3] wrote a philosophical drama Jīvānandana in 7 acts[4]. It is likewise a text-book on Medicine and an allegorical drama with religio-ethical (Śivaitie) tendencies. It presents how King Jīva (Life) in his Capital (śarīra), "body" is besieged by the army of diseases under the leadership of yakṣman (consumption) and at last attains victory in the strife through the grace of gods.

An instructive composition of a different type is the drama Bhārtṛharinirveda, ("the Drama of) Bhartṛhari's Disgust with the World[5]" of the Śiva-worshipper Harihara of Mithilā It is a peculiarly dramatised legend that belongs to ascetic poetry, of which we have found so many probes in the epic, purāṇic, Buddhist and Jaina literatures.

1. Published in Bibl. Ind., Calcutta 1854 and in Km. 87, 1906. Cf. Lévi 237 ff. To the 16th century belongs also the Dharmavijaya ("Victory of Religion") of Śukla Bhūdeva, printed in the Granthe-ratnamālā III, Bombay 1889.; see Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1596 f; Schuyler, Bibliography, p. 89.

2. Published in Km. 59, 1897. Cf. Haraprasād, Report I, 17 f.

3. According to Krishnamacharya, p. 112, his father was a minister of Śāharāja of Tanjore (1684-1711). See also Burnell, Tanjore 172b.

4. Edited in Km. 27, 1891. Detailed index by C. Cappeller in the Festschrift Windisch, p. 107 ff. Another allegorical drama of the same poet is the Vidyāpariṇayana, "Marriage of Knowledge", Edited in Km. 39, 1893.

5. Edited in Km. 29, 1892. Translated into English by L. H. Gray, JAOS 25, 1904, 197 ff. Harihara is mentioned also as the author of a drama Prabhāvatīpariṇaya (Gray, ibid 197).

According to tradition Bhartṛhari was a king. He loved his wife Bhānumatī very dearly. After a long period of separation from her husband, who wanted to go on a world-tour, once the queen said, that she would not remain alive without him. The king wanted to get this statement tested. He went on a hunt and got the rumour spread that he had been killed by a tiger. The moment the queen came to know of this she breathed her last. The king returned back and heard the unhappy news. Now he was wholly perplexed, burst into tears and reproached his own-self:—

svayaṁ nirmāyāndhuṁ bata hatadhiyāsminnipatitaṁ
mayā vyādāyāsyaṁ svayamahipateścumbitamidam ।
kṛpāṇena svena prahatamidamātmanyakaruṇaṁ
svayaṁ suptvā sadmanyahaha nihito dvāri dahanaḥ ॥

"A fool, I am, who dug a ditch into which I myself fell;
I myself opened the mouth of the snake that has bitten me;
With my sword I have mercilessly struck my my ownself;
Oh, I myself kept fire at the door, while I was sleeping inside the house."

In unrestrained perplexity he enters into a funeral pyre with the intention of burning himself with the corpse of his wife. Then there comes the ascetic Gorakṣanātha[1]. The latter appears as aggrieved and laments seemingly because his begging bowl is broken into pieces, in the same way as the king does for his deceased wife, and thus he makes the king feel that it is nonsensical to lament the death of any person[2] and that real happiness consists in renunciation of this world. But now the king does not like to have anything to do with his kingdom, government and worldly pleasures. But this helps him little and the

1. Gorakhnat, as he is usually called, the founder of the Śivaite sect of Kaṇaphaṭās ("torn-eared'), perhaps lived in the first-half of the 15 century A.D. Therefore, the drama must have been written sometime later. Cf. Gray, ibid 198; A. Barth, The Religions of India, 2nd Ed., London 1889, p. 218; D. P. Khakhar and G. S. Leonard, Ind. Ant. 7, 1878, 47 ff., 298 ff.,

2. Cf. the consolatory stories, above II, 115; transl. p. 143.

yogin brings to life his wife through his magical power. Bhānumatī, who is awoke from her slumber of death, is disdainfully rejected by the king. As the real ascetic likes, he knows nothing about his wife. All her imploring and coaxings are of no avail. Then the queen takes resort to the last means. She brings her children before the king and tries to arouse fraternal sentiment in him. But even this meeting evokes little response from him. He is convinced that this world is a lengthy dream, an illusion, a fata morgana, and he renounces his throne and the family. Then Gorakṣanātha praises him as the best of the nirvaṇa-seekers[1].

Not only was philosophy taught in the drama, but there exists also a drama that attempts to teach philosophy beside grammar. This object of curiosity is Antarvyākarṇa-nāṭyapariśiṣṭa[2] of Kṛṣṇānanda Vācas-pati. Here the verses are to be explained as having two meanings; on one side they mean rules of grammar and on the other they teach philosophy and moral.

Learned dramas of all types have been written in Sanskrit upto our times[3]. Dillīsāmrājya[4] written in the year

1. In act V the verse :
citraṁ citramaraṅgaraṅkamidaṁ nirbhittikaṁ śilpinaḥ
saṅkalpasya nikalpanairviracitaṁ cidiyomapaṭṭe jagat ।
dīrghasvapnamidaṁ vadanti sudhiyaḥ kepīndrajālaṁ punaḥ
procuḥ kecidathāntarikṣanagarimevāpare menire ॥
sādhu vatsa, sādhu । *sarvānapi nirvāṇaśālino*
jīvānātiśayya vartase, in which King Bhartṛhari gives expression to this feeling of renunciation of the world, partly reminds us of the Vairāgya-śataka, but verbal correspondences are not to be found.

2. That is to say "appendix to the dramatic art with inclusion of grammar", Published in Calcutta 1894; earlier editions 1840 and 1855 (see Schuyler, Bibliography, p. 66).

3. On the attempts that have been made for revival of the classical drama in modern India, see Lévi 401 ff., 466 ff. and Barth, Revue crit. 1892, 193, f. Amongst these dramas of the 19th century are included also the dramas having strong social bias, e. g. Kulīnakulasarvasva (nāṭaka) of Rāmanārāyaṇa Tarkaratna, written against polygamy and amongst the Kulīna Brāhmaṇas. Umeśacandra Mitra's Vidhavāvivāhanāṭaka, for introduction of remarriage of widows. (The purposive dramas Kulīnakulārṇava and Vidhavāvivāha are in Bengali and not in Sanskrit). European dramas too have recently been translated into Sanskrit : thus Shakespeare's Midsummer-Night's Dream" by R. Krishnamachariar under the title Vāsantikāsvapna, (Kumbhakonam 1892).

4. Madras 1912. The author had made a complimentary presentation of the work to Winternitz. An analysis and partial translation by Cappeller in Deutsche Rundschau, 39, 1913, p. 452 ff.

1912 by Pandit Lakṣmaṇa Sūri in 5 acts describing the coronation in Delhi, may be mentioned as one of the latest written dramas, that is composed strictly according to the model.

Not less than 51 characters appear in the piece and among them are also King George V and Queen of England, the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, Lord Curzon and others. A debate in the House of Lords is presented almost in the same manner as many centuries ago ministers discussed matters among themselves in the court of any Indian prince. By the side of the king and an American, who witnessed the coronation-ceremony from an airbaloon, and had travelled in a motor car from Bombay, an astrologer Dr. Perin was not missing. Without taking into consideration the anachronisms, here we find all that is most modern by the side of the oldest known Indian ornate poetical tendencies[1].

Bhāṇas and Prahasanas.

It is understandable that only a few of the more popular types of dramatic poetry of earlier ages have come down to us. They were composed for particular occasions and did not have enough of literary merits for the purpose of being retranscribed and preserved[2]. Hence it comes that the bhāṇas, dramas in monologue, and prahasanas, farcical comedies, that have come down to us, all are of comparatively of more recent times. They are mostly of unknown ages.

The bhāṇa consists of a single act, in which a single person actually appears on the stage; but this person holds conversation with a large number of people, who do not appear before the audience, but whose part is verbally repeated by the conveyor of the drama before he replies to it.

1. However, it is instructive, since it shows that the old features can occur even in wholly recent writings, as in India poems are always composed on earlier models.

2. The popular farcical comedies on the whole were never written down. "Rather the manager made his actors conversant with some plot, that often was of his own creation, and left the work of detailed performance to the improvising faculty of his troupe". (Fr. Rosen, Die Indrasabhā des Amānat, p. 4). The monologues (bhāṇas) and the farcical comedies, that we possess, are probably just court-imitations in the kāvya-style and in Sanskrit, of popular models in popular dialects. Now-a-days farcical comedies are performed at the end of presentation of a long piece, that takes up the whole of the night, towards the advent of the morning (Rosen, ibid).

For the purpose of giving representation to this type of dramatic poetry we may here briefly state the plot of one Ś ṛ ṅ g ā r a b h ū ṣ a ṇ a , "Ornament of God of Love"[1], of the poet V ā m a n a b h a ṭ ṭ a b ā ṇ a (15th century A.D.[2])

Matching with the plot of the drama, the introductory prayer has a strong erotic colouring. After the usual prelude in the form of a dialogue between the stage-manager and his associate is over, there enters the worlding (viṭa) Vilāsaśekhara and he remains all alone on the stage till the end. From his monologue we learn that after he has spent the night in the company of his beloved he gets further intoxicated with the rapture of love under the idea that he will stroll about in the harlots' quarters during the day for the purpose of being present on the occasion of the feast of puberty of the daughter of his friend Kāmamañjarī. He begins with a description in ornate verses of the sunrise and the dawning morning. As in a cinematograph, there pass before our eyes most colourful pictures of life in the harlots' quarters of the city, where harlots, procuresses, worldings (viṭas), court-fools (vidūṣakas) and dance-master (pīṭhamardaka) loiter about, and love-revelling is associated with chanting of music and song. His various encounters with the characters, who are not made visible to the audience, offer to our Vilāsaśekhara opportunities for more or less witty and humorous conversations and poetical descriptions. There he sees the beautiful Kamalāvatī at the terrace of her mansion:

smaramṛgayurvāgurābhānasitānavakīrya nakhamukhairalakān ।
taruṇajanahṛdayahariṇānnisargataralān grahītumudyuṅkte ॥

"With her fingers she is spreading her black hairs like the net of Kāma, the hunter, in order to entrap therein the gazelles, the wavering hearts of young man." He makes his glowing declaration of love and adds to it a malicious remark on the harlot's mother. Proceeding further, he meets the Brāhmaṇa-wordling (vipraviṭa) Mandāraka, the son of Mādhava, "who has misappropriated the amount

1. Edited in Km. 58, 1896.
2. See above p. 278.

that his father had left to his care for the purpose of performing sacrifices and who has taken the vow of offering the same to the god of love." He makes himself full of humour and he is comical in a seemingly heretic manner towards young Brāhmaṇas. One of his next meetings is with Indumatī, who is sporting with a ball. He describes admiringly her beauty and is envious of the ball, that she strikes with her lotus-hands and which, while falling upon or falling down, rests on her breasts. The beauty invites him to an idle gossip. But laughing, he remarks that he fears to miss the feast of his friend and advances further. Then he utters—

"The maiden, whom I see there at the summit of the mansion, is awaiting her lover, who has been turned out by the mother.

ābhāti malayamarutā taralitasaṁvyānapallavā taruṇī ।
cārutaranayanaśapharā śambararipuvijayavaijayantīva ॥

"This young girl looks like the victory-staff of Cupid; her delicate mantle fluttering in the wind is the flag-cloth and her wandering eyes are the śafara-fish set therein[1].

(Having looked carefully). Here is Vāsantikā, the daughter of Mādhavī. (Approaching her) Friend Vāsantikā, what are you, sitting on the summit of the mansion, doing there? What do you say ? "I am gazing at the majestic beauty of the grove that has become charming with the advent of the spring:—

komalastabakanamrā cārupallavarāgiṇī ।
mākandamiha vāsantī saṁtyajya kimu śobhate ॥

"Does the jasmine-shrub, bent down on account of clusters of delicate blossoms, shine forth after it has left the mango-tree and longs for beautiful sprouts.[2]"

Smiling bashfully, why are you keeping silent ? What do say ? "I know your great affection for my friend Mākanda." Has he been expelled by the mother,

1. The god of love carries śapharas (small but very much moving fish) in his banner.
2. The stanza has two interpretations and can also mean: "Does Vāsantikā rejoice her after she has deserted Mākanda (her lover), bent down with the delicate tufts (of her mantle), seeking the sweet pleasure of love?"

greedy of money, overpowered with the devil of old age? What do you say? "That your honour knows to read the feeling of another person". Friend Vāsantikā, let the crow caw and let the wheel of the water-mill move along. See !

ākrandanaṁ kāmukakālarātriḥ
karotu tāvajjananī piśācī ।
tathāpi bhūyādiyamavyapāyā
mākandasaṁbhogarasānubhūtiḥ ॥

"Let the devil, of your mother, who is as unkind as the night of death for the lover, just cry and bewail. Still let this pleasure of union with Mākanda be incessant."

Our viṭa advances further. One of his next meetings is with a group of female dancers who are going to some drama-hall. In order to enjoy their presence he visits his friend the dance-master Guṇadatta, praises his method of dance-training and does not feel ashamed in giving expression to his sentiment of love for a dancing girl. Then an enchanting swing-song strikes his ear. His friend Makaranda celebrates the spring-swing festival in the company of his beloved. The viṭa comes nearer, admires the beauty and repeats the swing-song that she sings[1]. In the meantime it is noon and the viṭa rushes forth into the garden of his girl-friend Candravatī, on account of heat. After he has some chat for a little while, he moves further and meets a realistically described old woman, for whom he utters the proverb : *vṛddhā vāravilāsinī vānarī bhavati*, "an old harlot becomes a she-monkey". She has in her grip a young man, "who had married" her daughter six months ago without discharging his monetary obligations; she is dragging him to a court of law. Our viṭa interferes in the quarrel as a mediator. It is followed by a description of a ram-fight, of a cock-fight, of a fight between two wrestlers, and of a bloody fight that takes place between two rivals. Then he meets one of his old beloved, who reminds him of his amorous pleasure of the last night. Then he listens to the wonderful and charming sweet tune of the harp of beautiful

1. It is a Prākrit-song, the only Prākrit passage found in the bhāṇa.

Mañjubhāṣiṇī, till when it is evening. Now it is time to attend the festival of his female-friend. He describes the splendidly decorated hall in which his female friend is celebrating the feast of her loving daughter. He praises her beauty. His woman-friend hurls herself upon him for embracing him. He wishes happiness to her daughter and finishes with the usual concluding dramatic song that is as erotic as the nāndī in its content.

This monologue is not wanting in poetically beautiful passages — at least according to the Indian conception of ornate poetry—still the limits in respect of obscenity, the limits that can be tolerated by western taste are transgressed more than once.

There are other bhāṇas, that are of the same type and of similar contents, that have come to be known up to this time[1]. Even the Mukundānanda of Kāśīpati Kavirāja[2], [who lived in the early part of the 18th century in the court of Nanjarāja of Mysore], in which Kṛṣṇa has an unendingly long and mostly erotic conversation in verse and prose with his male and female friends (who do

1. Such bhāṇas are the Vasantatilaka of Varadācārya (See Lévi, 255 f. and Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1620 f. [The author is known also as Ammālācārya. It was written in the 14th century A.D. and has been edited by Ḍamaruvallabha Śarman, Calcutta 1868; editions also by Vavilla Ramanujacharya, Madras 1872, and also Jivananda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta 1874; cf. S. K. De, ibid, p. 489], the Sāradātilaka of a poet Śaṅkara (contents in Wilson II, 384 ff.; [the author was a native of Vārāṇasi—S. K. De, HSL, p. 490], the very much ornate and seemingly extensive Rasasadana (published in Km. 37, 1893) of Yuvarāj a of Koṭiliṅgapura in Kerala, the Śṛṅgāratilaka (published in Km. 44, 1894 [it is called Ayyābhāṇa to distinguish it from Vasantatilaka which is called Ammābhāṇa; cf. S. K. De, ibid, p. 489] of Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita (17th century), and the Śṛṅgārasarvasva (published in Km. 78, 1902) of Nallā Dīkṣita son of Bālacandra Dīkṣita. Nallā (apparently towards the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century) is the author of one Subhadrāpariṇayanāṭaka, as well. [Some of the others bhāṇas, that we have come to know of by now are:— Karpūracarita (ed. GOS, 8, 1918, in the Rūpakaṣaṭka) of Vatsarāja of Kālanjara (end of the 12th century A.D.) the Pañcabāṇavijaya of Raṅgācārya (ed. V. Rāmasvāmī Śāstrulu in Telugu characters, Madras 1915), Rasikarañjana of Śrīnivāsācārya. See also Sten Konow, Indische Dramen, p. 121-123 and S.K. De—A Note on the Sanskrit Monologue Play in JRAS, 1926, 63 ff.]

2. Published in Km. 16, 1889. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat., p. 1615 knows an edition brought out in Madras in 1882. [On the author and his date see M. P. L. Shastry, NIA, IV, 1941, p. 150 ff.]

not appear on the stage), makes little distinction between God Kṛṣṇa and common worldlings such as appear in other bhāṇas.

Almost none of the prahasanas or comedies of earlier ages has come down to us, and even of the productions of recent days only a few have been printed[1].

Saṅkhadhara of Kannauja wrote the comedy Laṭakamelaka, "The Association of Scoundrels"[2], for the entertainment of his king and patron Gavindacandra in a spring festival, probably in between 1113 and 1143 A.D. The famous Dhūrtasamāgama," "The Meeting of the Rogues"[3] of Jyotirīṣvara Kaviśekhara, son of Dhīreśvara is a work of later years. The contents of this piece may be summarised as follows:—

The student Durācāra makes a confession before his teacher, the mendicant Viśvanagara, that he loves the harlot Anaṅgasenā, at which the teacher creates in him the impression that he too is in love with the beautiful Suratapriyā. The teacher and the disciple both go in for common begging. This brings them into the house of Anaṅgasenā. The teacher is so much charmed at her sight that he wishes

1. Many more may probably be existing in manuscripts. Bühler once told Winternitz that he had brought with him very many prahasanas from India, but he was not thinking of publishing them on account of their being too obscene. To an earlier age (7th century A.D.) belongs the Mattavilāsa-prahasana of Mahendravikramavarman (edited by Gaṇapati in TSS, No. 55, 1917). It is of little literary value.

2. Published in Km. 20, 1889.

3. Edited by Chr. Lassen in the Anthologia Sanscritica (Bonn 1838), pp. 66-96, 116-130, and by C. Cappeller, Jena 1883. According to Haraprasād, Report I, p. 23, it was written in 1324 A.D. Lassen places it in the 2nd half of the 15th century... Cf. Lévi 252 f. [Keith, HSL, p. 261 has given the following account about this work:— of much later date is the well-known Dhūrtasamāgama of Jyotiriśvara Kaviśekhara, son of Dhaneśvara, grandson of Rāmeśvara of the family of Dhīreśvara, who wrote under the Vijayanagara-king Narasiṁha (A D. 1487-1507), though a Nepalese manuscript makes his father Dhīrasiṁha and his patron Harasiṁha, who has been identified implausibly with Harisiṁha of Simraon (A. D. 1324). S K. De, HSL, p. 497:—"The Meeting of Knaves" of the Maithila Jyotiriśvara Kaviśekhara, son of Dhaneśvara, grandson of Rāmeśvara of the family of Dhīreśvara, was composed under King Harasiṁha or Harisiṁha of the Karṇāṭa-family, who ruled in Mithilā during the first quarter of the 14th century. But the relevant lines read: *rāmeśvarasya pautreṇa tataḥ abhavataḥ pavitrakīrterdhīreśvarasyātmajena kaviśekharācārya-jyotiriśvareṇa viracitaṃ dhūrtasamāgamaṃ nāma nāṭakam.* So Jyotiriśvara was a son of Rāmeśvara and a grandson of Dhīresvara. Cf. S. K. Chatterji, Introduction to Varṇaratnākara, p. XV.]

to take her into his own possession and thus incurs the displeasure of his disciple. They fall in violent quarrel. With the intention of getting rid of both of them the harlot goes to a court of arbitration. They approach the Brāhmaṇa Asajjātimiśra. who tries to arrive at a decision in respect of this difficult case of arbitration. The act II takes us into the house of this gallant Brāhmaṇa, who even enters into a philosophical discourse with the vidūṣaka in which the former asserts that the essence of life consists in the enjoyment of love, whilst the latter maintains the view that theft of money belonging to another person is not less heinous than enjoyment to another man's wife. In the meanwhile there comes the mendicant with his disciple. They place before the arbitrator their points of difference. Then Aśajjātimiśra is moved at the beauty of the harlot and he orders that she must stay with him till he arrives at a decision. While she is staying in his house, the vidūṣaka tries to obtain her. At this stage the barber Mūlanāśaka arrives and asks Vasantasenā to clear the debt that she owes to him. She refers him to Asajjāti, who pays him out of his pupils's purse. Then the Brāhmaṇa requests the barber to shave his hairs and pair his nails. But the barber chains his hands and feet and runs away. The Brāhmaṇa cries for help and the vidūṣaka sets him free.

A still worse company we meet with in the farce Hāsyārṇava[1] of Jagadīśvara. Here not only the priests, but also princes, doctors and astrologers are ridiculed. In the house of a harlot we find a Śaiva mendicant, his disciple, a quack, a police officer who reports with great satisfaction that the state should be in the hands of thieves, a military officer who overpowers a leech, etc. In act II there appears a Brāhmaṇa, who claims to have composed the Vedas and to have been in the heaven, where he thrashed Lord Śiva. At the end of the 16th century Saint Sāmarāja Dīkṣita wrote a

1. Edited by C. Cappeller, Jena 1883; also printed in India (Calcutta) 1835 and 1872. [and Ed. Śrīnātha Vedāntavāgīśa, with a commentary, Calcutta 1896.]; cf. Wilson II, 40 ff.; Lévi 253 f. Its age has not been determined.

comedy Dhūrtanāṭaka [1], that ridicules the Śaiva ascetics, one of whom had fallen in love with a dancing girl[2]. One Pandit Gopīnātha is the author of the comedy Kautukasarvasva, that was played on the occasion of the autumn festival during the Durgāpūjā in Bengal (we know not when). The drama is rather a satire on kings and their ministers than on religious men.

Another satire on the kings is the drama Kautukaratnākara [3] of a poet, who calls himself Kavitārkika, son of Vāṇīnātha. He was the chief priest of King Lakṣmaṇa Māṇikyadeva [end of the 16th century A. D.]. The hero is a silly king whose wife is kidnapped away and who utilizes the services of all sorts of scoundrels and fools for her recovery. Even the names of characters of this piece are comical. Thus the chief priest's name is Ācārakālakūṭa ("poison of discipline"), the name of a guard of the harem is Pracaṇḍcaśepha, the military general is Samarakātara ("terrified in battle"), and the police officer is Suśīlāntaka ("ender of courtesy") and the doctor is Vyādhivardhaka ("increaser of disease").

Even these farces are composed in the language of ornate poetry, and not unoften even in a bombastic style. It can, however, be hardly doubted that these too have been written for the purpose of offering amusements in courts and that on the model of popular farces already present in popular dialects.

[Here a mention has to be made of the four one-act monologue plays that were discovered and printed as late as 1922. They have been included in a single volume under the title Caturbhāṇī [4]. The titles of these four bhāṇas

1. According to Wilson II, 407 the drama is not an attractive production, but at the same time it is less vulgar than other prahasanas what Klein (Geschichte des Dramas III, 371 f.) has described in the words: "The farce has the merit of a bald-head that is free from noxious insects and hairs at the same time" [On Sāmarāja Dīkṣita's age (latter part of the 17th century) and his works, see S. K. De, Sanskrit Poetics, I, p. 320 and P. K. Gode ABORI, X, p. 158 f.]

2. Cf. Wilson II, 410 ff.; C. Cappeller in the Gurupūjākaumudī, (Festschrift A. Weber, Leipzig, 1896) p. 59 ff. [Ed. Rāmacandra Tarkālaṁkāra, Calcutta 1828. Dacca University MS No. 1580 D.]

3. Extracts in Cappeller, ibid 62 f. and Eggeling Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1618 ff. [and Dacca University MS No. 1821.]

4. Ed. Rāmakṛṣṇa Kavi and S. K. Rāmanātha Śāstrī, Śivapurī, Trichur. Edited again under the title Śṛṅgārahāṭa by Moticandra and Vāsudevaśaraṇa Agravāla, Bombay

are Dhūrtaviṭasaṁvāda, "The Dialogue between the Rouge and the Rake", Ubhayābhisārikā, "The Drama of the Girl who meets two lovers", The Padmaprābhṛtaka, and the Pādatāḍitaka, "The Drama of the Kicked." We know nothing about the authorship of any one of the first three bhāṇas, and about the fourth we know from its colophon that its author was one Udīcya Śyāmilaka, son of Viśveśavaradatta[1]. The other three dramas are attributed to as follows:—the Padmaprābhṛtaka to Śūdraka, the Dhūrtaviṭasaṁvāda to Īśvaradatta and the Ubhayābhisārikā to Vararuci. But this attribution is based on a single traditional stanza[2] that is mentioned in the introduction to the Caturbhāṇī by its editors and said to have been found at the end of Padmaprābhṛtaka.

In the opinion of scholars the, probable age of these bhāṇas falls in about the 5th century A.D., and in any case none of them was written later than the 10th century A. D.[3], especially as the Pādatāḍitaka is quoted by authors who, lived not later than that century.

Except in the Dhūrtaviṭasaṁvāda, the hero is not the viṭa, but a friend of the viṭa. This friend-hero does not appear before the audience, but all that he does is reported by the viṭa on the stage on which he alone makes his appearance. In contrast to other monologue plays, these bhāṇas give not only descriptions of amorous adventures of the viṭa, but other topics of interest too are introduced[4] in them.

A mention may here be made of the Bhagavajju-

1959. with introduction, Hindi translation and notes. Ubhayābhisārikā translated into English by Sukumar Sen, Calcutta Review 1926, p, 127-147. The Padmaprābhṛtaka, with English translation, etc. by J. R. A. Loman, Amsterdam 1956. For Bibliography see Appendix Six, Ed. Moticandra.

1. See p. 150 and p. 259 of the Caturbhāni, ed. Motīcandra.

2. The stanza reads:

vararuciriśvaradattaḥ śyāmilakaḥ śūdrakaśca catvāraḥ

ete bhāṇān babhaṇuḥ kā śaktiḥ kālidāsasya ।

3. S. K. De, HSL, p. 248 ff.; JRAS, 1926, p. 63 ff. See also F. W. Thomas, JRAS, 1924, pp. 129-36 (Centenary Supplement); P. T. Burrow, The Date of Śyāmilaka's Pādatāḍita, JRAS, 1946, p. 46. ff.

4. For detailed criticism see S. K. De, (ibid).

kīyam[1] and the Dāmakāprahasana[2] of unknown authors and age. In the former Śāṇḍilya, a disciple of a Buddhist saint, falls in love with Ajjukā, a prostitute, who is bitten by a snake and dies. The saint's soul enters into the body of Ajjukā with the intention of setting the mind of his disciple on proper line. The soul of Ajjukā is put through mistake of Yama's agent into the body of the saint. Now with the soul of the saint Ajjukā behaves like the saint and the body of the saint with the soul of Ajjukā behaves like the latter to the great astonishment of everybody. But Yama's agent becomes aware of the mistake, and the two souls are let re-enter into their proper bodies. The Dāmakāprahasana is an imitation of the usual type of the vidūṣaka episode of a drama, and perhaps it is part of another drama, and not an independent work. The Naṭavaṭaprahasana[3] was written by one Yadunandana, son of Vāsudeva Cayani. It is of an unknown date. It does not conform to the requirements of a prahasana and does not present any noteworthy literary quality.]

NARRATIVE LITERATURE

Tales, fables and stories belong to the best productions of the Indian mind and they were elevated to the status of real literature in India earlier and in a much greater measure than among the other civilized countries. As we have already seen above, they occupy not only a prominent position in respect of religious books of the Buddhist and the Jainas[4], but also in respect of ornate poetry, they are not of an inferior standing.

1. Editions—A. Banerji-Sastrī, JBORS, 1924; with a commentary by P. Anujan Achan, Cochin 1925 Prabhākara Śāstrī Madras 1925.

2. Ed. K. Venkatarāmaśāstrī, Lahore 1926. See also Jolly in Festgabe Garbe, Erlangen 1927, p. 115-121.

3. Ed. Granthamālā, Bombay 1887.

4. We can hardly arrive at a decision as to whether the Buddhists or the Jainas had contributed more towards development of the Indian narrative literature and towards circulation of Indian stories. In any case it is an exaggeration to say, as assumed by Hertel, that we ought to be grateful to the Jainas, "due to whom we possess simple excellent prose of the type of narrative literature" (Geist des Ostens 1, 1913, p. 185). It can never be true, since we find the use of Sanskrit in Jaina literature first of all in the 9th century A.D., when Sanskrit prose had long before become fully developed.

For the people of the West in many respects these tales, etc. are more valuable than all other branches of Indian ornate poetry.

When one reads the court-epics, in which the same old narrative materials are repeated again and again and the dramas, that, with a few exceptions, contain the same themes over and again, with which we have already become familiar in the epic, whilst in the comedies the same intrigues are repeated with minor deviations according to certain pattern, one could be led to believe easily that Indians lacked in creative genious as such. What a great difference in narrative literature ! What an inexhaustible phantasy in creating wonderful intricacies in stories ! How much of spirit and wit in respect of inventing sober and comic scenes in the fable: what an abundance of increasing new materials in stories, novels and fictions[1] ! Unlike other types of Indian poetical works, in this narrative literature the tendency is not to delineate only the stereotyped figures, but we meet here quite often several types of people—in fables men in the guise of animals—that exhibit a distinct physiognomy. And these men are not only virtuous kings or bold warriors, or beautiful and loving princesses and venerable priests, as in the epics and mostly in dramas too, but also people from other spheres of life, viz farmers, manual workers, salesmen, artisans, and all sorts of people like jugglers, swindlers, rascals, selfish Brāhmaṇas, hypocrite monks, harlots and procuresses. Lastly, no branch of Indian ornate poetry has exercised so great an influence on foreign literatures and has become so much important for world literature as the narrative literature. It is most wonderful that the Indian narrative material has passed from nation to nation in such a way that we find in almost all the countries of Europe and Asia and even among those of Africa, stories and tales of which the original home was in India. And the fact is that not only have individual stories, per hazard, found their way from India into other countries through oral transmission by traders and tourists, but the entire bulk of Indian books, as we shall see, have through translations become common to the people of different countries. For a long time it was generally believed that India was the

1. F. von der Leyen, "Das Indische Märchen" in the Preuss. Jahrbüchern, Bd. 99, 1900, p. 62 ff. sets down fine characteristics of Indian narrative literature.

birth place of all tales. But with advancement of our knowledge of folklore and ethnology this theory has been completely exploded. But the fact still remains that many tales of different nations have had their original home in India.

Long before the existence of bigger narrative works in Indian literature, it was possessed of all sorts of tales and stories that offered amusement to the people. Besides there were stray fables that were invented for teaching religious or worldly lessons. Tales, swangs, anecdotes and stories that were in circulation among the people for a long time and the fables that were included in different places in literary works formed partly the source and partly the model for stories contained in narrative works. In India, as in other countries, tales and stories have occupied in all the ages the same place as the so-called light literature does during the modern days[1]. Tales are different from myths, that almost always try to explain something and satisfy some urge for knowledge or a religious necessity in the same manner as from the fable, that always tries to teach and follows the padagogical objective in one or the other way. Hence it comes that tales and stories had been in existence among the people long before they found entry into literature and that they found their place first of all in Prākrit literature[2], whilst the fable originated in literature itself, and in all probability it belonged to Sanskrit literature from its very beginning. However, it is also probable that the animal fable sprang up from animal tales, and the former added to itself short gnomic stanzas, that are instructive sentences. There are many gnomic stanzas that at the same time contain fables *in nuce*. These gnomic stanzas are very often placed at the top of the stories, just like the titles in the narrative literature of the West[3].

1. Cf. Benfey, Kleinere Schriften II, 158; Jacobi, GGA 1892, 632.

2. Cf. Jacobi, ZDMG 48, 416.

3. About Indian fables, the opinion of K. Müllenhoff (Zeitschrift f. deutsches Altertum, N. F. 6, 1875, p. 1) on the German fables literally holds good: "Many old German proverbs contain small animal-fables: the heron scolds water, because he can not swim; if the mouse is fully fed food tastes bitter, etc. Gnomic stanzas were enlarged poetically more than once into fables, so conversely were many fables abridged into gnomic stanzas.". The German word "Spruch" (saying) should be used for "Sprichwort" (proverb) in respect of India.

The fact that adages always constitute essential elements of Indian fable-poetry should also point to its still earlier origin.

The characteristic form of narrative literature, therefore, is a mixture of prose and verse, in which the latter are partly metrical tales and fables[1] and partly gnomic stanzas. It is only of the later times that we come by works of narrative literature written wholly in verses. Narrative works that are written wholly in prose are rare, and in ornate novels too verses have been intercalated within a limited range.

Thence it follows that the oldest tales and stories do not really belong to proper literature, and any effort to trace their beginning would be fruitless. Certain tale-like stories that we have found in Vedic works belong to mythical, declaratory and legendary poetry and not to genuine tale-literature[2]. Likewise some animal-stories, that we find in the Upaniṣads, such as the story of the dogs, who assembled around a white dog, in order that he procures for them food through hymns,[3] or the stories of Jānaśruti, who attracts the attention of pious Raikva to the conversation of the two flamingoes, or the one of

1. Partly these are kathāsaṁgraha-stanzas, that is verses, in which the subject-matter of the story is abridged, ("Headline-stanzas"), and partly they are ākhyāna-stanzas, that is the stanzas that themselves form part of the narrative (tale-verses). Cf. Hertel, Das Pañcatantra, p. 37. Sometimes, however, many ākhyāna-stanzas are put together in a ballad. Hence, there are (for example in the jātakas) several stray fables and tales in the form of ballads, although elsewhere the ballad is just the form of narration for myths, sagas and legends.

2. The stories of Purūravas and Urvaśī, of Śunaḥśepha, of the monkey Vṛṣākapi and other Vedic ākhyānas and itihāsas, exactly as the monkey-stories of the Rāmāyaṇa, belong to a line of development different from proper narrative literature. They are parrallel channels of narrative poetry and not the forerunner of works like the jātakas or the Pañcatantra. The stories that were narrated in the preliminary ceremony (pāriplava) of the horse-sacrifice, after a funeral celebration etc. (see above I, 259 ff.; trans. p. 311), were not tales and fables, but itihāsa and purāṇas. When Amalānanda (13th century) in the Vedāntakalpataru posits that stories of the type of Tantrākyāyika should be narrated in the Pāriplava (see G. A. Jacob, JRAS, 1911, 511), this evidence of so late an age proves nothing. Winternitz does not consider as probable that there took place an uninterrupted development from Vedic literature down upto the Tantrākhyāyika and the ornate novels (as assumed by Hertel, WZKM 23, 1909, 345; 24, 1910, 122f. and pointed out also by Oldenberg, NGGW 1911, 457). The region in which ākyānas and itihāsas were cultured in the form of ballads were quite different from those in which tales, fables, fictions and novels had been popular.

3. Chāndogya-Up. 1, 12, that appeared, according to Indian view, as correctly allegorical to Winternitz, is in the opinion of Deussen "a satire on the activity of priests and their egoistic ulterior motive."

Satyakāma, who receives by turn instructions from a bull, from a flamingo and a swan[1], can hardly be called fables.

In Indian literature we come by the earliest fables in the Mahābhārata, and in fact, in the epic proper, as also in book XII[2]. The existence of fables in India in the 3rd century B. C. is proved by the reliefs on the stūpa of Bharhut (2nd century B. C.[3].) As regards their currency during the age of the grammarian Patañjali in the 2nd century B. C. the evidence is to be found in learned formations like *kākatālīyam* "unexpected, as in the fable of the crow that was killed by a palm-fruit falling down" and *ajākṛpāṇiyam* "in the manner of the she-goat and the dagger" or in "that of the she-goat killed by a dagger[4]."

In case we now review the actually existing narrative literature of India, we can divide it under the following groups:—

1. A great mass of popular tales, stories and swangs, that we now know in a larger number, meant only for spiritual or worldly objective, that were originally circulating just orally. They are found in popular languages, and not only in Sanskrit.

2. Collections of stories that were gathered together for religious propaganda by some compilator or compilators. To this class belong the jātakas and other story-books of the Buddhists and the Jainas, that were no doubt told for the satisfaction of the people[5].

1. Chāndogya—Up. 4, 1; 5; 7; 8.

2. Cf. above, I, 349 f., trans. 405 ff; Mahābhārata 8, 39 and 41; Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata, IV, 88 ff. Probably in the Mahābhārata 12, 1-130 we may find the precursor of the Pañcatantra.

3. See above II, 13 and 102; transl. p. 17 and 127.

4. Mahābhāṣya, on Pāṇ. 2, 1, 3 and 5, 3, 106 f. Cf. Weber, Ind. Stud. 13, 486. It is noteworthy that in the Kauṭilīya-Arthaśāstra, animal-tales are not mentioned. "As against this, throughout there abound political maxims and epigrammatic expressions that bear comparison with natural kingdom, living and not-living, in which we are to find the rudiments of political fables (Hertel, WZKM, 24, 1910, 421).

5. In a more limited measure, the Brāhmaṇas, the Brāhmaṇical sects and schools make use of this very method. Such is the way of teaching of the Sāṁkhya in respect of elaboration of basic principles by means of stories. Therefore, the Sāṁkhyaśāstra contains a section on narrative (ākhyāyikādhyāya), see Sāṅkhyapravacanabhāṣya, translated from Sanskrit into German by R. Garbe, (AKM IX, 3, p. 251 ff. and Jacobi, SBA 1911, (P. 270).

3. Narrative works in Sanskrit that pursue the express objective of teaching political principles and wordly wisdom. Of this type is the Pañcatantra in its numerous recensions and redactions.

4. Narrative works, that offer crude entertainment (didactical subsidiary objective excepted) in the form of fictions with intercalated stories, firstly in Prākrit and later in Sanskrit too. To this class belong the Bṛhatkathā with its later redactions, the Vetālapañcaviṁśati, Śukasaptati and others.

5. Fictions and novels in Sanskrit ornate prose (Daśakumāracarita, Vāsavadattā and Kādambarī).

The works of the last three groups are not compilations but compositions in ornate poetry, of which the authors try to build their narrative stuff partly from the first two groups and partly invent it independently. But in any case they have to make efforts in framing and arranging them in the form of an independent work. The popular and generally usual form of narrative work is the so-called "intercalation[1]". In a frame-story are included stories in a small or large number, and each of such stories can in turn serve as a frame for one or more other stories: In every kind of Indian narrative work we find tales, fables and stories beside one another. In the middle of a narrative, that has purely the affairs of human-being as the subject-matter, we always find also tales, relating to the world of wonder and witchcraft of super-human beings, and animal-stories, in which human behaviours are carried over to the animal world[2]. In the narrative works, that pursue some padagogical objective, naturally the fable predominates, and the tale prevails in works of light literature. Hence the latter too are far more dependent upon popular narratives and tales than the former do. Since the fables and stories, that are meant to inculcate a political or wordly wisdom, are generally the creation of a poetical

1. In the epics and in the purāṇas too, we find a certain type of intercalation and also consequent narrative given in the first person (I-story). It is just a refinement of this natural type of narration, when not only the hero narrates his story, but some other persons as well retell their stories.

2. This too is wholly understandable, since according to the Indian conception of the world the different forms of creation are essentially alike, and between gods, demi-gods, spirits, men and beasts, the difference is not qualitative, but merely quantitative, that is capable of being levelled in course of repeated births.

personality and not popular in the real sense of the term[1]. They became popular in course of time, as has probably been the case with the stories of the Pañcatantra and with the Aesopean fables. As against this, the tales have generally been popular, inasmuch as they spring up directly from the heart of the people, that is from religious ideas and myths, from popular belief in witchcraft and from the whim of story-telling men and women, drawn from the common people. In most cases there is no objective other than to cause amusement to one's ownself or to others[2].

The common name for all the different types of narratives in Sanskrit is ā k h y ā y i k ā "little story, small narrative" and k a t h ā, "conversation, entertainment, narrative". In manuals of poetics attempt is probably made to distinguish between these two terms and to employ each of them for two different kinds of composition in prose; yet the authors of these manuals are not all alone in the respect of their use[3].

THE PAÑCATANTRA IN ITS OLDEST TEXT-FORM

No work of Indian literature has so long and eventful a history as the Pañcatantra. The credit of making its history clear goes to the greatest extent to two researchers: T h e o d e r B e n f e y[4], who has followed the course of history of this work beyond India in its travel into different regions of world

1. Similarly already B e n f e y, Pantschatantra I, 103.

2. That does not stop even moral ideas incidentally finding expression in these tales and stories, when they are turned into ornate poetry. Down upto present times Indian poets have remained a particular class of teachers of morality.

3. Kāvyādarśa 1, 23-28; Dhvanyāloka 3, 7 f. Patañjali (on Pāṇini 4, 3, 87 Vārtt. 1) gives as examples of ākhyāyikā the titles of works that are probably fictions: Vāsavadattā, Sumanottarā and Bhaimarathī. Bāṇa calls his historical novel Harṣacarita an ākhyāyikā, while he has referred to his romantic fiction Kādambarī as a kathā. In the Pañcatantra single stories are called kathā. In the Kathāsaritsāgara, the stories are generally called kathā, and several times also ākhyāyikā. Kṣemendra in the Kathāsaritsāgara mentions kathā as the chief narrative. and ākhyāyikā, the intercalated stories (See S. K. D e, in BSUS, III, p. 307 f).

4. Pantschatantra, fünf Bücher indischer Fablen, Märchen und Erzählungen. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetezt mit Einleitung und Anmerkungan I. II Leipzig 1859.

literature and Johannes Hertel[1], who has elucidated the history of the Pañcatantra in India itself through critical editions of the most important relevant texts and with a large number of scientific researches. [Another scholar, who has succeeded in going back to the primary Pañcatantra is Franklin Edgerton[2], who has further examined in detail the different available versions of the work].

It is just too easily understandable that the original form of the text of a work that consists of a large number of single stories and gnomic stanzas, in course of its long history, has undergone alterations in a very strong measure. Thence it is evident that in such a work new stories and new epigrams have got included in a large number, that the stories, that did not please later redactors have been replaced by others, and that some ambitious writers have effected real or supposed improvements, refinements, intentional alterations—new motifs. But in spite of all changes that the Pañcatantra has undergone in its centuries-long course, it has not altogether obliterated its original character. It has always remained, according to its original plan, a work of which the objective has obviously remained to teach in a pleasing style what the Indians call the nītiśāstra, "the science of conduct" i.e. the art of administration, and which is called also by another name—arthaśāstra, "the science of worldly gains". In other words, the Pañcatantra has from the very beginning been a work, that was meant to teach the art of administration and wordly wisdom through fables, stories and epigrams. In its original form it was used for teaching of princes, as it is mentioned in the introduction (kathāmukha) found in all the extant versions. But in later-day redactions, it has rather become a book of training mainly

1. Über das Tantrākhyāyika, die kaśmīrische Rezension des Pañcatantra (CXXII. Bd. der ASGW), Leipzig 1904; Tantrākhyāyika, the älteste Fassung des Pañcatantra aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen I, II. Leipzig and Berlin 1909; the same published, Berlin 1910; Pañcatantra, seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung, Leipzig and Berlin 1914. Cf. Winternitz, DLZ 1910, Nos. 43 and 44; 1914, Sp. 2430 ff. and F. Edgerton in the American Journal of Philology, Vol. 36, 1915, 44 ff., 253 ff. An "editio minor" too has been published by Hertel in the HOS., Vol. 14, 1915.

[2. JAOS, XL, p. 271 f. Pañcatantra Reconstructed,... Text, Critical Apparatus, Introduction and Translation. New Havan 1924.]

for youth, and not only for that of princes[1]. Purely moral stories were added into later redactions, and there too not in a considerable number.

The original text of the Pañcatantra, commonly mentioned as the "primary work", is in fact no more available to us, yet we are in a position to arrive at a well-grounded conclusion with regard to its condition with the help of the still—extant or deduced oldest redactions of the work. The redactions are :

(1) the Tantrākhyāyika, that is preserved for us in an older recension and a younger one[1].

(2) The text that was translated into Pahlavi[3] in about 570 A.D. Actually neither this text nor its Pahlavi translation is available by itself. But we are able to draw a conclusion posteriorly about the existence of the Pahlavi translation and its Sanskrit original[4] on the basis of the translations into Syriac[5] and into Arabic[6] made from Pahlavi, as also from the European renderings made from Arabic.

(3) An extract from the Pañcatantra, that was included in the Kashmirian Bṛhatkathā, that is now lost to us and is preserved for us in the two metrical resettings in Kṣemendra's Bṛhatkathāmañjarī and Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara[7]. The stories of the Pañcatantra are narrated without interruptions in Kṣemendra, whilst Somadeva has added a fool's story at the end of each book of the Pañcatantra. It is now clear that the stories in the Bṛhat-

1. Hertel (ZDMG 57, 1903, 640) mentions the different versions of the Pañcatantra straightway as "school-books". This has certain justification now a day, when the Pañcatantra and similar story-books are included among the books that are translated into modern Indian languages and are used in schools. In many Sanskrit manuscripts is found the copyist's remark, as communicated to Winternitz by Hertel, that the owner of the work had got it transcribed for the study of his children.

2. See above p. 308, note 1.

3. Made by Burzoe under the title *Karaṭaka wa Damanaka.*

4. Details about these translations further below.

[5. Made by Būd in about 570 A.D. under the title *Kalilag wa Dimnag*), edited by Schulthess, Berlin 1911.]

[6. Made by Abdullāh Ibnul "Muquffa", under the title Kalila wa Dimna, Ed. Cheikho, Beyruth 1923.]

7. Bṛhatkathāmañjarī XVI, 255 ff. Kathāsaritsāgara 60-64. Leo V. Mankowski. Der Auszug aus.. dem Pañcatantra in Kṣemendras Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, Einleitung, Text Übersetzung und Anmerkungen, Leipzig 1892.

kathā have very much deviated from their original objective and have been transformed into light literature, although the original motif is not wholly forgotten; when Gomukha narrates them to Prince Naravāhanadatta for his education, he remarks that even in the case of animals wisdom prevails over strength. Neither of the two versions has any independent value, and both of them represent the old texts of the Pañcatantra of importance, and in fact Kṣemendra's version is of less value than that of Somadeva.[1]

(4) A very abridged selection "for instruction of the boys, who have learnt little", that is available in South Indian manuscripts and hence called "South Indian Pañcatantra"[2]. As shown by Hertel, this goes to a North-Western abridgement made after the 7th century A.D. Difficult passages have been excluded. The importance of this text lies in the fact that it stands so close to the Tantrākhyāyika that it can be utilized for reproduction of the original text. Further there exist, in a large number, enlarged and popular recensions made from it that have contributed much towards circulation of the work. There are several extant recensions of this abridgement;

(5) A Nepalese Selection of Stanzas that stands very close to the "South Indian Pañcatantra" and goes back to a north-western text. Although preserved in a unique MS it is of importance for the purpose of criticism[4].

---

1. Cf. Speyer, Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara, p. 36 f. Hertel, Das Pañcatantra, p. 30 ff.

[2. Ed. of the recension α by Heinrich Blatt, Leipzig, 1930. Ed. of recension β by J. Hertel, Leipzig 1906.]

3. One of these recensions has been edited in an incomplete form by M. Haberlandt in SWA 107, 1884, 397-476. Hertel, Das südliche Pañcatantra (Vol. XXIV of ASW), Leipzig, 1906 gives a critical edition of another recension. Cf. Hertel Das Pañcatantra, p. 33 ff. (Hertel, Das Pañcatantra, seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung, Leipzig 1914, Index p. 451 f., registers 200 different versions of the work known to have been existing in over 50 different languages of the world, and that spreading from Java to Iceland.

4. Cf. Hertel Das südliche Pañcatantra, p. LXXXVIII ff; ZDMG 64, 1910, 58ff and Das Pañcatantra, p. 37 f. According to Hertel, this and similar metrical redactions have had as their objective to serve as foundations for new redactions in Sanskrit and popular languages. It is also probable that the stanzas were copied so that they could become aid to memory for the purposes of oral narration.

In respect of the text these five recensions agree among themselves to such an extent that Hertel has rightly traced them to a common single source, and from their correspondences he has drawn the conclusion that the Tantrākhyāyika—the only complete Sanskrit text among these recensions—provides the best picture of the primary work, that is to say it stands next to the original Pañcatantra[1]. Hence generally speaking, it also holds that whatever may be said with regard to the Tantrākhyāyika is equally valid also for the primary work of Pañcatantra.

The Tantrākhyāyika is now just a work of Sanskrit ornate literature. Its prose is ornate, and as such it is especially replete with characteristic long compounds. Its verses comprise of play of words, duplicity of meaning and linguistic subtleties, that are peculiar to court ornate poetry. Besides many stanzas are composed in fully ornate metres. Yet all this is treated with moderation. Its prose does not have the artificiality of language that we find in the novels of Daṇḍin, Subandhu and Bāṇa as well as in the Jātakamālā[3]; even in the case of verses, the artificiality in respect of metres is considerably seldom. However, the author was a man of taste who certainly knew well the kāvya-style, but did not adopt it for the simple

1. We are not in a position to decide the question whether the title of this primary work should be called "Tantrākhyāyika" or "Pañcatantra". In any case the fact remains that the work attained its highest peak of fame in the whole of India under title Pañcatantra only. The title Tantrākhyāyika (i.e. Tantrākhyāyikam Nītiśāstram) means: The Instructive Stories comprising (of a manual of Wordly Wisdom and Art of Administration)" and the Pañcatantra means "The five Books" or "The five Instructive Sections or Books (comprising of a manual on the art of administration)". Cf. Hertel, WZKM 20, 1906, 81 ff., 306 ff.; Tantrākhyāyika, Übersetzung I, 7 f and Winternitz, WZKM 25, 1911 49 ff. F. W. Thomas translates the title: as "Authoritative Text (for Policy) in the form of an Ākhyāyikā and "Authoritative Text (of Policy) in five (Books)". Inaccurate is Lacôte's rendering (in Mélange Lévi, p. 269): "livre composé d'histoires" and too learned is the explanation of Jacobi (GGA 1905, 383): "Sammlung von ākhyāyikās in tantras", "die in Bücher eingeteilte Erzählungssammlung."

2. This does not refute the position that in a number of cases the Tantrākhyāyika has not only some interpolated texts but also a corrupt text.

3. Jacobi, GGA, 1905, 377, and Hertel, Tantrākhyāyika, Übersetzung I, 22, compare the Jātakamālā. But this belongs to a different type: it is a campū, in which narrative ornate prose alternates with ornate stanzas composed in the kāvya-style. The Tantrākhyāyika is not a campū, as here the verses serve a wholly specific purpose and have been inserted and employed in a quite special manner.

stories that he was going to narrate[1]. He was certainly not a poet of insignificant humour and wit. It will be wholly perverse to regard this work as a collection of popular stories[2]. Probably the author has made use of older materials as well, but he has reproduced them in a free and independent manner. And above all, he has fashioned anew the peculiar class of this sort of narrative works. Although the method of introducing stories within stories and of mixing prose with verse had been in vogue from a very early age in India, still the art of framing and intercalation of stories, as we find in the Tantrākhyāyika, and the art of mixing prose firstly with instructive epigrams and secondly with verses, that in a certain measure contain the whole story *in nuce*, are characteristic of this work. It was also a new idea to teach political wisdom (*nīti*) in this ornate manner. Besides the poet has not made use of only the stories that were existing from before, but he has also composed new fables and stories. Likewise he has not increased the volume of his work just with copious quotations of stanzas, but he has himself too composed a large number of strophes that occur in it. The Pañcatantra became a popular book for the first time in its later redactions, although it was originally not so, nor was it conceived as such[3]. Even the refineness with which some of the stories are narrated speaks against its popular origin. As regards the purpose of the work, that it was written to serve as a convenient manual of politics for sons of rulers, the introduction found in all the recensions leaves no doubt.

After the poet has, in the preliminary stanzas, expressed his veneration for the gods, the teachers and the masters of politics—Manu, Vācaspati, Śukra, Parāśara, Vyāsa and "Cāṇakya, the Great," he says : Viṣṇuśarman too, after he has gone through the essence of the arthaśāstras existing in the world, has written in these five books a thoroughly delighting book of lessons. Then it is said:

1. So for example is the comic story of "the louse and the bug" (I, 7) deliberately written in a very flowery kāvya-style. Contrary to this is the story of the "blue jackal" (I, 8), in which too we find an ornate kāvya-style, apparently an interpolation.

2. So Mańkowski, ibid p. LIV and Kirste, WZKM 23, 1909, 387 ff.; 29, 1915, 246 ff.

3. In India there are only a few and incomplete manuscripts of the old text of the Pañcatantra that is represented by the Tantrākhyāyika.

In the city of Mihilāropya in South India, there ruled a king Amaraśakti, who was the wish-yielding tree for the desire of all the needy people. His feet were coloured with the mass of rays of pearls and diamonds of highly exalted princes (who bowed down before him)". He was well versed in all the fine arts as also in arthaśāstra. He had three sons, none of whom had much interest in these sciences. Then the king summoned his council for the purpose of consulting them for deciding upon the means by which knowledge could be imparted to those boys. And one of his courtiers pointed to Brāhmaṇa Viṣṇuśarman, who was thoroughly conversant with nītiśāstra and had studied into other branches of knowledge as well. The king permitted him to come near. Viṣṇuśarman, an old man of eighty years, "caused his lion-roar voice to be heard...", "the king may exile him from his country, in case he does not in six months make the boys expert in nītiśāstra". The king and the ministers got astonished at this inconceivable promise of the Brāhmaṇa. However, the king put the princes into his charge. "And Viṣṇuśarman invented a useful method and wrote five books for instruction. And among beasts or men there is none who has not been brought within the reach of his imagination in appropriate places[1]."

Each of the five books that go to form the work, probably in its frame story, was meant to teach the main principles of nītiśāstra. The frame of the first book forms the story of the fruitful effort of the cunning jackal

1. As in the introduction to the Tantrākhyāyika, so also in all other recensions of the Pañcatantra, Viṣṇuśarman is mentioned as the author of the work, notwithstanding the fact that many of the later recensions have different authors (Pūrṇabhadra, Nārāyaṇa). Benfey (ibid I, 29 ff) has already posed the hypothesis that the name Viṣṇuśarman has been brought in the introduction only, just to recall Viṣṇugupta, another name of Cāṇakya. [But no direct influence of Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra can be traced in the Pañcatantra—S. K. De, HSL, p. 86, note 1.] Hertel (Tantrākhyāyika, Übersetzung I, 4ff; Das Pañcatantra, p. 7) has corroborated this opinion. Though it is not improbable that Viśṇuśarman had been the real author of the primary work, in any case it is striking that it has been expressly said that he had written the book and not just narrated or explained it to boys. Cf. Winternitz, WZKM 25, 1911, 1911, 52 ff. Whether the author was a Kashmirian or not, as assumed by Hertel (Tantr. Übersetzung I, 23; ZDMG 60, 1906, 787 ff.), in the opinion of W., it is doubtful, as is also the case with F. W. Thomas JRAS 1910, 974 f.

Damanaka to cause a rift in the friendship of the lion Piṅgalaka and the bull Sañjīvaka. The two jackals, Karaṭaka and Damanaka are the ministers of the lion, the king of beasts; and in the dialogue between the two ministers are discussed the basic principles of politics and the relationship of the ministers with the king. This is done partly with the help of citations from treatises on politics and partly with fables and stories that are sometimes narrated by the one and sometime by the other.

Book II, in its frame-story, shows how even the weak, who are fast friends, are capable of saving themselves even against a powerful enemy through mutual help. There is an old fable that appears to be found in its oldest form in the Mahābhārata (V, 64) and has been repeated also in the Jātaka (No. 33) that shows the process in which man can avoid danger through unity; whilst it is narrated how the birds with their united strength flew away with the hunter's nest and saved themselves. This old fable has been enlarged by the author of the Tantrākhyāyika and has been very nicely written for the purpose of instructing on the efficacy of friendship in the matter of success in political affairs. Parallel to the bird-fable is narrated how the Coloured Neck (Citragrīva), king of the pigeons, has Gold (Hiraṇyaka), the mouse-king, as his friend, and the latter cuts through the stitches of the net and frees each one of the birds. The crow Light-flying (Laghupatanaka), who has seen all this, seeks friendship with each of the two animals, and very soon they have two more friends, the tortoise Slow (Manthara) and the deer Coloured-body (Citrāṅga). How the last one is caught in the net of a hunter and how he is saved with the united effort of the friends is narrated in a most charming manner. Numerous proverbs and epigrams on wisdom in respect of choice of friends and also on the advantages of friendship and of mutual help bring life into the story. In this book we find few intercalated stories, and this fact significantly shows how the fable has sprung up from the animal tales.

In the frame-story of Book III too, that is meant to illustrate the political principle of War and Peace, the

author has an old fable, that we meet with for the first time in the Mahābhārata[1], where it is told how the surviving Kauravas were resting under a tree, on which owls had their nest and how at night crows came and killed the owls. This is an occasion for making a reference to the nocturnal attack on the camp of the Pāṇḍavas and to the bloody killing of the whole of the epic. On the basis of the highly simple story of the Mahābhārata, the author of the Tantrākhyāyika has worked out the tales of the fight of the crows and the owls, of the slyness of the minister, the crow, of the destruction of the fort of the owls and of killing of their inmates with the highest skill, whilst he has included a large number of lessons on the different types of ministers, on their duties, on the relationship of the king and his ministers, and on making of war as well on the use of tricks and bravery in war. Closely connected with the frame-story is the fable of the selection of the king of birds that has resulted in enemity of the owls and the crows—an old well-known tale in world-literature. Other intercalated stories are the fables of the ass in the hide of a panther, meant to demonstrate the harm of talkativeness, the fable of the hare and the elephant meant to show that even a weak animal can defeat a mighty master too through craft, the tale of the rat that was transformed into a girl who did not consider even the sun, the cloud, the wind and the mountain suitable to be her husband and finally selected a rat for her groom, etc.

The frame-story of book IV goes to show how a fool is deceived when he speaks about a business that he has undertaken in response to false words. As an illustration of it serves the fable of the crocodile and the monkey, who pretends that he has hung his heart on a tree. The intercalated-story of the ass without heart and ears teaches the same moral.

The frame-story of the fifth book forms in the Tantrākhyāyika the touching story of innocently killed mongoose, that is meant to serve as a warning against

1. Parvan X, see above I, 312; transl. p. 368 and Benfey I, 336 ff. It is noteworthy that Kāmandaki (Nītisāra IX, 40) refers to the fight of the owls and the crows in the Mahābhārata and to that in the Pañcatantra.

thoughtless action. The same moral is taught also by the intercalated story of the Brāhmaṇa who was building a castle in the air.

It may be doubted if the last two books, particularly the fifth book, have come down to us in a complete form or if many of the fables that entered into later recensions of the Pañcatantra have been or have not been brought together in these books. Likewise it is also possible that these later recensions fabricated new narratives for the purpose of filling in the gaps that the old texts required.

Whilst in the first three books, at least in their frame-stories, attempt has been made to express explicity the relevant political principles, the 5th and 6th books contain merely lessons regarding common worldly wisdom. No sharp line of demarcation can be drawn between these two "sciences". For princes, general worldly wisdom is as much necessary as knowledge of political principles in stricter sense of the term. Hence we find among the epigrams many stanzas, that teach political as well as wordly wisdom likewise[1]. Nevertheless the Tantrākhyāyika has predominently the character of a manual of politics. We find at different places of the book big sections that have a purely technical theme: so is the case both with prose and metrical passages, that have been quoted partly verbatim from manuals of politics. At the end of the first book is found the verse that is so unusual in the Indian conception of politics:

na manuṣyaprakṛtinā śakyaṁ rājyaṁ praśāsitum ।
ye hi doṣā manuśyāṇāṃ ta eva nṛpaterguṇāḥ ॥

"A state is governed not by the customs prevailing among common men:

For, what is a mistake for the people is of use for the king."

A number of citations are taken from the Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra. Technical terms of the nītiśāstra too occur frequently[2].

1. Of the 451 adages of the Tantrākhyāyika, 205 teach political principles (rājanīti), 138, general worldly wisdom and only 108 have moral, philosophical or religious subject-matter.

2. Cf. A. Hillebrandt, Über das Kauṭlīyaśāstra and Verwandtes, Breslau 1908, p. 9. f.; Hertel, Tantrākhyāyika, Übersetzung I, 141 ff. and the edition, p. 169 ff.

In case the history of the nītiśāstra had been already clear, we would have a chance for determination of the course of development of the Tantrākhyāyika and of the oldest recension of the Pañcatantra. But unfortunately we are not in a position to determine the measure in which Kauṭilīya-Arthaśāstra is the genuine work of Cāṇakya, the minister of King Candragupta. All that we can say is that the Tantrākhyāyika did not originate before the age of Cāṇakya, that is the 3rd century B.C. Provisionally this only may be stated that the Pañcatantra had become a famous work already in the 6th century A.D., that under an order of King Chosru Anōshirwan (531-579 A.D.) it was translated into Pahlavi, and that as early as 570 A.D. a Syriac translation from Pahlavi was ready. We would be able to arrive at the truth at least approximately in case we could put the age of its writing between 300 and 400 A.D. The Tantrākhyāyika apparently creates an antiquarian impression, and without doubt it is one of the oldest works of Indian ornate poetry[1]. But since there are doubtless interpolations even in older recensions of the Tantrākhyāyika, the age of the primary constituent of the Pañcatantra has to be placed earlier than that of the Tantrākhyāyika.

We are not in a position to arrive at a chronological conclusion from the religious and otherwise cultural conditions as presumed in the Tantrākhyāyika. Among the religious ideas we find nothing that could particularly be very old. The general social life, as described, is Brāhmaṇical with Vaiṣṇava tendencies. In respect of mythology we find the common epic-purāṇic divine world, as it is commonly described in ornate poetry. The minister is usually a Brāhmaṇa. Brāhmaṇas are fed on the full-moon and new-moon days. The

1. As the "oldest of .. the extant work of Indian ornate poetry" (Hertel, Tantrākhyāyika, Übersetzung I, 22), we need not point to the Tantrākhyāyika. The poems of Aśvaghoṣa are older. The often recurring word *dīnāra* (denarius) proves that it was written after the 2nd century A. D. The word rūpaka that occurs once (text p. 157, line 5) is mentioned as a gold coin for the first time in Āryabhaṭṭa (born 476 A.D.), but rūpa, "picture" is older; see Lüders, SBA 1919, p. 749 f. The author of the Tantrākhyāyika considers the Mahābhārata as an authoritative work, since a number of verses, (for example II, 103-106) are quoted as of "Vedavyāsa".

Brāhmaṇical order has attained its perfection. Killing of a Brāhmaṇa is considered a grave offence. In brief we find ourselves in the Brāhmaṇical world. Only in this sense the work can be said to be "Brāhmaṇical", but not in any way in the sense that it has any kind of Brāhmaṇical colouring or in the sense that it aims at propagation of Brāhmaṇical influence. Religious ideas stand wholly far away from the author. Brāhmaṇas and priesthood are not by all means spoken in very good terms. A greedy wandering monk is the hero of the third story of book I. The cat in the fourth story of book III is the type of the sanctimonious ascetic. In the epigram IV, 13 the greedy nature of Brāhmaṇas has been alluded to :

dharmamarthaṃ ca kāmaṁ ca tritayaṁ yobhivāñchati ।
soriktapāṇiḥ paśyeta brāhmaṇaṁ nṛpatiṁ striyam ॥

"He who is in quest of the triad;
Who strives in quest of religion,
In quest of gold and in quest of love,
Must not go empty-handed
To the priest, to the king and to his wife."

In the Tantrākhyāyika there is no allusion to Buddhism. This has been observed by B e n f e y. He has further elaborated that the Pañcatantra has a Buddhist origin. But today this must be considered to have been fully refuted. The very nature of the book as a manual of politics shows that it can never be a Buddhist work, since Buddhists have never admitted the justification for any effort made for earthly prosperity and for earthly power as presupposed in nītiśāstra[1].

1. Therefore, in the Buddhist recensions of the Pañcatantra, some nīti-stories have been transformed into dharma-stories. Cf. H e r t e l, JA 1908, Nov.-Dec. 399 f. A. B a r t h (Melusine IV, 1888-89, 558 f.) and B ü h l e r (Verhandlungen der 42. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Wien 1898, p.504) have already refuted the theory of Buddhist origin of the Pañcatantra. Hertel (WZKM 20, 1906, 113 ff) has raised objections against revival of this theory by Ed. H u b e r (BEFEO 24, 707, 755). B e n f e y had arrived at his decision with regard to the Buddhist origin of the Pañcatantra, because he could find many of the stories among Buddhist tales and stories, the antiquity of which he very much exaggerated. In fact we come across many of the Pañcatantra-stories in the Jātaka-book, but we can hardly state with certainty that in such cases the Jātaka-book depends upon the story existing in some earlier recension of the Pañcatantra. Thus for example the Jātaka Nos. 349 and 361 have been taken from the frame-story of the Pañcatantra I. Cf. H e r t e l, WZKM 16, 269 ff.

The ethical standpoint of the Tantrākhyāyika too is basically different from that of Buddhism. The virtues of the common man are the same as those of a responsible head of a family. Fidelity to friends and hospitability are particularly esteemed high. But the real morality of chivalry, essentially different from the morality of asceticism, holds good also for the king and the warrior. Their duty is to fight in order to enter into the heaven. The pigeon-king Citragrīva of book II is the model of heroes and princes - faithful, courageous, sacrificing, but not peace-loving. Even the blessings of contentment is praised, as in verses, II, 78 ff., or when in II, 83, it is said: "What is religion ? Kindness towards the being", it is not to be interpreted from the standpoint of ascetic - morality, but from that of the fighter, who is not obliged to save all the animals (*ahiṁsā*), but only the weak, who have resigned into his care and have been assured of protection and security (*abhaya*).

Notwithstanding the fact that the Tantrākhyāyika does not deny that its aim it to teach administrative and wordly wisdom, great stress is laid on the narration of entertaining stories. In the matter of transformation of an animal-tale into an animal-fable, there is still left behind much of the original, that is not even touched by the didactic tendency[1]. The stories are not always well-knitted together[2]. For the author it is of much more importance to bring in a beautiful story than to set nicely his interpolation. We must keep this thing always before our mind when the question is raised whether a story in a Pañcatantra-recension is "genuine" or "spurious," i. e. whether it belongs to the primary work or not. We should not declare each story as has been inappropriately or forcibly inserted into the collection as spurious. Above all we are not in a position to differentiate between individual stories on the basis of their being genuine or spurious. Generally speaking, it may probably be taken as correct that the subject-matter and the extent of the basic work are capable of being deduced from the whole of the oldest recension. Thus for example, if a story

1. Thus the story of Hiraṇyaka's experiences (II, 1) has just quite incidentally also the instructive tendency. Primarily it is an animal-tale. The story of the courser-bird (I-, 10), who humiliated the ocean, is more an animal-tale than a nīti-teaching fable.

2. Thus for example, I, 2 and I, 5.

does not occur in all the recensions, but only in some of the old ones, it remains doubtful whether we can include it in the text of the primary work. Reversely, it is not impossible that an old story may have found place just in one of the younger recensions of the Pañcatantra[1].

In the case of epigrams it is still more difficult to determine whether they belong to the original text of the Pañcatantra or if they have been interpolated later than it is in the case of the stories. The various recensions of the Pañcatantra strongly differ from one another in respect of epigrams, and in later recensions the epigrams occur not only more frequently, but also appear in very inappropriate contexts. This is seldom the case with the Tantrākhyāyika. It is true that the epigrams as also the narrative stanzas belong to the original text of the work. But we are not in a position to believe that the narrative stanzas that either introduce or conclude individual stories are taken from the stories that were originally metrical[2]. It might have been the case with some particular stories, but it is not so in general. Then only in exceptional cases we find even in the middle of the stories narrative stanzas here and there, and they are more like tales in verses, that are inserted at random in places of importance in the tales current in western countries for the purpose of making the stories lively. As a rule the narrative strophes serve merely as introduction and conclusion; whilst at the same time they allude to their morals and in a few words the subject-matter of the story.

We are hardly in a position to distinguish between the epigrams cited from those written by the author of the Tantrākhyāyika. Since many of the epigrams occur only in the Tantrākhyāyika, (and in later recensions of the Pañcatantra) we can consider these in any case as based on stories invented of the author. Many of the epigrams found in the anthologies that are attributed to Cāṇakya or to Bhartṛhari might have their original place either in the Tantrākhyāyika or in the primary

1. Hertel, Tantrākhyāyika, Übersetzung, I, 98-126 gives a survey of the general contents of the primary work. Cf. also Man'kowoski, ibid, p. LIII, and Benfey, ibid I, 419 f. and 340 ff. Hertel, in his researches on the Tantrākhyāyika, has attempted to maintain a distinction between the stories of doubtful genuineness and those of "doubtlessly spurious" origin. But many a time we ought to put a question-mark after "doubtlessly". Cf. notes of W. in DLZ 1910, pp. 2759 ff.

2. So Hertel, WZKM 25, 1911, 19

work of the Pañcatantra. In any case the epigram sconstitute the essential part of the work, and many of them, on account of their wit and humour are not less noteworthy than the fables and stories. Here are some of the examples:—

rājānamapi sevante viṣamapyupabhuñjate ।
ramante ca saha strībhiḥ kuśalāḥ khalu mānavāḥ ॥ (I, 27)

"The wise men serve the king,
They can swallow even poison,
They enjoy the company of women."

yadaśakyaṁ na tacchakyaṁ yacchakyaṁ śakyameva tat ।
nodake śakaṭaṁ yāti na nāvā gamyate sthale ॥ (II, 20)

"What is not possible is impossible;
What is possible is possible;
A cart does not move in water;
One cannot travel on a boat on land."

sarvaḥ sampattayastasya saṁtuṣṭaṁ yasya mānasam ।
upānadgūḍhapādasya sarvā carmāvṛtaiva bhūḥ ॥ (II, 79).

"He who is mentally content,
For him everything is prosperity :
He who has covered his feet with shoes,
For him the entire earth is covered with leather."

Later Redactions of the Pañcatantra.

None of the old texts of the Pañcatantra has been so popular and has had such a wide circulation in India as the so-called "Textus simplicior", that is the recension of the text that has been best known in Europe and that for the longest time and up to the time of discovery of the Tantrākhyāyika was considered to be the Pañcatantra[1]. It is wholly a new redaction of the old work, rather a completely new work. A lage number of recently written stories and stanzas have been brought in, whilst many of the stanzas occurring in old recensions have been left out. The stories

1. The complete title of the "Textus Simplicior", as also of "Textus Ornatior", is "Das Lehrbuch der Regierungskunst, Namens Pañcākhyānaka, mit anderen Namen Pañcatantra". The "Textus simplicior" has been edited by F. Kielhorn and G. Bühler, BSS I, III, V ; translated into German by L. Fritze, Leipzig 1884. Cf. Hertel, Das Pañcatantra, p. 70 ff.

are narrated in a clearer and simpler language, mostly in a better style, and always they are longer and more comfortable than in the Tantrākhyāyika. Particularly in books IV and V, that contain only a few stories in the Tantrākhyāyika, there have been interpolated[1], in a large number narratives, tales and also pornographical stories, that certainly originated in a wholly different region of stories and possibly have been taken from other books or from popular oral tradition.

Of this text, according to Hertel, there are two recensions that "differ very little in respect of the subject-matter, but almost throughout in respect of the language." The same researcher has proved that this "Textus simplicior" ultimately goes back to the same North-Western text, to which goes back probably the Pahlavi translation, as also the redaction from which has been abridged the Southern Pañcatantra. This text must have been current for a long time in North-West India, before a redactor gave to it the present form[2]. Hertel[3] has also made it probable that this redactor, whose name is not known, was a Jaina and had been living in between the middle of the 9th and the 11th centuries A.D. However, we must make a note of the fact that any Jainistic tendency is not positively visible in the work, in which the stories are based on Brāhmaṇical back-ground exactly as in the old recension of the Pañcatantra. In this respect the new recensions differ as little from the old text as in respect of the purpose of teaching the science of administration and worldly wisdom[4].

In this recension too the fable-element dominates, and among the twenty stories, that were included in it later, there are nine fables that might appropriately have occurred in the old recensions. Among the rest, we find seven tales,

1. Reversely the Tantrākhyāyika, in book III, contains many intercalated stories, whilst there are found only 4 in the "Textus simplicior". It almost appears that like the individual parvans of the Mahābhārata the different books of the Pañcatantra too had their independent circulation.

2. Cf. Jacobi, GGA 1905, 377 ff.

3. Hertel in BSGW 1902, p. 62 ff.; cf. also Jacobi in GGA, 1905, p. 380 ff.

4. Whilst the old recensions are associated with Cāṇakya or with the Kauṭilīya - Arthaśāstra, attributed to him, in later recensions the Kāmandaki's Nītiśāstra is mentioned and cited as the main authority.

one intrigue-story, a witty anecdote, one story about adultery and one story of fools. One of the most famous tales is that of the Weaver as Viṣṇu (I, 5), of which the subject-matter is briefly reproduced here below:—

A weaver falls in love with a wonderfully beautiful princess. His friend, a cart-wright, helps him to have a meeting with her. He makes a wooden Garuḍa[1] that can fly in the air. The weaver mounts him, having assumed the form of God Viṣṇu, and one night he enters into the palace of the princess through a window. She takes him to be God Viṣṇu, who marries her in the Gāndharva form. After sometime marks of enjoyment of amorous-pleasures become visible on the person of the princess. The king is told about it, and he is very happy to hear from his daughter that God Viṣṇu Himself has become his son-in-law. Proud of his powerful son-in-law, the king feels extraordinarily courageous and annoys the neighbouring kings. They enter into war with him. His capital-city is besieged and menaced by a powerful army. Then the king, with his daughter as the intermediary, invokes his divine son-in-law for help. In fact the city is saved by the weaver who appears in the sky in the form of Viṣṇu mounted on Garuḍa. Since the real Viṣṇu does not like that man should lose confidence in Him, He is obliged to enter into the body of the weaver and causes Garuḍa to enter into that of the wooden bird[2].

In a far greater measure than in the Tantrākhyāyika, in the textus simplicior, as in all later redactions of the Pañcatantra, the character of the work stands out as an anthology of epigrams. Without or with little consideration either for cohesion or for propriety and impropriety of occasions, a long

1. The bird Garuḍa is the conveyance of God Viṣṇu.

2. Hertel (BSGW 1902, p. 115 f.; Das Pañcatantra, p. 72 f.) has reproduced this story, that he has translated into German in "Bunte Geschichten aus dem Himālaya", p. 50 ff, as a proof in support of his hypothesis that the author of the "textus simplicior" was a Jaina, since only a heretic could speak about God Viṣṇu in such a "contemptuous manner". Winternitz, (with Edgerton, American Journal of Philology 33, 1912, 273 ff.), however, is of the opinion that it is very much probable that this story may not have been wholly a "satire in reference to Viṣṇu. In popular stories gods are spoken about with doubtful respect. The original place of the story apparently was in a wholly different narrative work, perhaps in the Vikramacarita, where it occurs in several manuscripts.

series of epigrams have been brought in. Nevertheless most of these epigrams teach either science of polity or worldly wisdom in the widest possible measure[1].

The so-called "textus ornatior" i.e. the Pañcākhyānaka or the Pañcatantra, that was completed by the Jaina monk Pūrṇabhadra in the year 1199 A.D. at the command of King Soma, is based on the "textus simplicior", with the later recension of the Tantrākhyāyika too having been utilized. This is the best of the available later recensions[2]. Pūrṇabhadra himself says that he has revised the Pañcatantra "syllable by syllable, word by word, sentence by sentence, story by story and verse by verse". He has, however, partly from unknown source, introduced a number of new stories and epigrams[3]. Linguistic peculiarities show that Pūrṇabhadra, has *inter alia* used also Prākrit works or stories in popular dialects[4]. Among the lately interpolated stories are found several that are known also from other sources, such are the tales of grateful animals and ungrateful people (I, 9)[5], the tale of the pious pigeon and the hunter (III, 8) based almost *verbatim* on that of the Mahābhārata and the comical story of the two hen-pecked (IV, 6) and others. Some of these stories are included also in manuscripts of the "textus simplicior".

Both the recensions made by the Jainas[6] have had the widest circulation in India, and from them have sprung up

1. Of the 869 epigrams (found in the edition of Kielhorn and Bühler) there are 381 that teach politics (rājanīti) and 388 general wordly wisdom and only 140 are moralistic sentences.

2. It is presented also in a fine critical edition of Hertel in HOS Vols. XI-XIII (1908 and 1912). R. Schmidt in his German translation Leipzig, Lotusverlag 1901. Again Berlin and Leipzig 1909. W. had not used the critically edited text. (A. W. Ryder, Chicago 1925 has translated the critically edited text into English.). Cf. Hertel, Das Pañcatantra pp. 20, 76 ff.

3. Pūrṇabhadra has 21 stories, that are not found in other recensions. Hence Hertel (ZDMG 56, 1902, 324) was able to call the "textus simplicior" as the "textus ornatior" (so Kosegarten). According to Hertel (WZKM 17, 1903, 343 ff.; HOS XII, p. 15 f.) Pūrṇabhadra had utilized Kṣemendra's selections.

4. Gujaratisms and Prākriticism shown by Hertel, HOS XII p. 29 ff.

5. Translated by Benfey, ibid, II, 128 ff. On the Buddhist versions, see above II, 104, 180 f.; transl. p. p. 129 f., 225 f.

6. Neither of the two recensions is characteristically "Jainite". As pratical people the Jainas too had enjoyed influential positions in courts and consequently were interested in nītiśāstra too. Some of the stories of

numerous "mixed recensions" and "new recensions" even in the popular dialects[1].

A selection from one of these mixed recensions was made during 1659-60 A.D. by the Jaina monk Meghavijaya "for imparting simple instruction to boys" under the title Pañcākhyānoddhāra[2]. This text contains several new stories, many of which are of importance for study of comparative folk-lore and for discussion of the question of relationship of Greek and Indian poetical fables. The stories of Ratnapāla, added at the end, that does not occur in any other recension of the Pañcatantra, are Jaina-made legends that are based partly on stories of the Hindus[3].

The "South Indian Pañcatantra" too presents a very much enlarged Sanskrit-text. In this text many stories, taken from different recensions of the Pañcatantra and prepared from Tamil sources as well, have been recently added. Most of the lately added stories are tales that have had their original in popular literature. The language of this work has been called "Cooked Sanskrit" by Hertel[4].

The Tantrākhyāna, that too is preserved in Nepal, shows points of contact with the Jaina-recensions[5], particularly

the Pañcatantra are found also among the Āvaśyaka-stories of the Jainas that are attributed to the 7th century A.D. by Leumann (OC XIII, Hamburg 1902, p. 24 ff). But it is still open to question whether the stories originated actually in the Pañcatantra, or whether, as there, so here too they have been construed rather from popular stories.

1. To this class of texts belongs the thoroughly uncritical edition of J. G. L. Kosegarten (Bonn 1848) that has its importance even upto this day on account of the fact that the well-known translation of Benfey is based on it.

2. Hertel, ZDMG 57, 1903, 639 ff; ZVV 1906, 249 ff; Pañcatantra, p. 105 ff. The main source of Meghavijaya was a metrical Sanskrit recension, that is based on the Pañcākhyāna-Caüpaī, an old Gujarātī-recension made by the Jaina monk Vaccharāja in the year 1591-92.

3. In one of these stories is found a passage that reminds us of Bürger's ballad "Der Kaiser und der Abt." The question that is put is how much of water and how much of mud is in the sea. To this wise Dhanadatta replies: "much mud, and little water is there in it. In case you do not like to believe this, dam the river and count the water of the sea."

4. "Über einen südlichen textus amplior des Pañcatantra", ZDMG 60, 1906, 769 ff., 61. 1907, 18 ff.; Pañcatantra, p. 304 ff. Since it contains not less than 96 stories, it is the most copious of all the Pañcatantra texts. This text stands very close to that of the book "Le Pantcha-Tantra ou les cinq ruses", published by Abbé J. A. Dubois in 1826.

5. On the Jaina-recensions based also the Kathāmṛtanidhi of Ananta and a recension by Dharmapaṇḍita. Cf. Hertel, Das Pañcatantra, p. 250 ff. and 307 ff.

with that of Pūrṇabhadra, as also with the "South Indian Pañcatantra", particularly with the "textus amplior". Of this Tantrākhyāna there are three recensions: 1, that contains only Sanskrit stanzas, of course narrative stanzas; 2, the one that gives mostly stanzas and stories in Sanskrit; and 3, the one that, in addition to Sanskrit stanzas, gives stories in the Nepālī language (Newārī)[1]. We are not in a position to decide whether or not the writer of the stories in prose is identical with the compiler of the anthology. The Tantrākhyāna was earlier considered to be a Buddhist work[2]. But it has as little to do with the Buddhist religion as with Jainism, even if of some the stanzas may have been taken from some Jaina source. The compiler should have been living in the 14th century A.D., and in no case he was posterior to 1484 A.D., the date of one of the manuscripts.

The most important of the recent recensions of the Pañcatantra is the Hitopadeśa, "the Wholesome Advice[3]", that was compiled in Bengal and is best known both in India and in Europe. In fact it is a wholly new work, of which the Pañcatantra, in all events, is the main source and that in its North-Western Indian version, on which is based also the South Indian Pañcatantra as well as the Nepālī collection of stanzas. In the colophon the author mentions his name as Nārāyaṇa and that of his patron as Dhavalacandra. On the antiquity of the origin of the work we can say this much only that it was written between the 9th and the 14th century A.D.[4]

In the introductory stanzas the author says that his work is based on the Pañcatantra "and" one other book." By the latter is apparently meant a hitherto-unknown story-book. But Nārāyaṇa has gone very far in an independent manner . He

1. C. Bendall, JRAS 1888, p. 465 ff.; Hertel, ZDMG 64. 1910, 58 ff.; Pañcatantra, p. 313 ff., where the first recension too is fully included,

2. So Bendall, ibid, Leumann in BSGW 1902, p. 132 and Barth, Mélusine IV, 561.

3. Critical editions are those of A. W. v. Schlegel and Ch. Lassen (Bonn a. Rh. 1829-1831) and of P. Peterson, BSS No. 33, Bombay 1887. Besides the Introduction to the editions, cf. Hertel, Über Text und Verfasser des Hitopadeśa, Diss., Leipzig, 1897, and Pañcatantra, p. 38 ff. On individual manuscripts of the Hitopadeśa see Hertel, ZDMG 55, 1901, 487 ff.; 64, 1910, 58 ff. and Zachariae, ZDMG 61, 342 ff.

4. An old Nepalese MS was prepared in the year 1373 A.D. Hultzsch has located quotations from Māgha's Śiśupālavadha in the Hitopadeśa (see Hertel, Tantrākhyāyika, Übersetzung, I, 145 f.). In the

has reversed the order of the first two books and has divided into two the third book, that is called "Fight and Peace" in the Pañcatantra'[1]. He has included the contents of the fifth book in these two books and has omitted the frame - story and the intercalated stories of book V. Hence the work consists of only four books: I Winning of Friends, II Dissension among Friends, III War and IV Peace. The warring animals are not owls, but a flamingo and a peacock with their followers. The fable has been very much altered and the frame-story of book IV has been constructed anew. Even individual stories have been further extended or undergone alterations[2].

Of the 17 stories of the Hitopadeśa, that are not found in other recensions of the Pañcatantra, 7 are fables, 3 are tales, 5 are love- and women's stories and 2 are religious narratives. One of the last two (III, 7) is the story of the servant who was faithful to his master, that is of Rajaput Vīravara, who offered to sacrifice one and every member of his family to Goddess Durgā. This story, as also the adulterine stories, and the stories of pranks of women have been taken from different story-circles[3].

Hitopadeśa occurs the expression bhaṭṭārakavāra, "day of the Lord", for "Sunday", a nomenclature of this week-day, that is not found in India in any inscription of a period earlier than the 5th century A.D., but had become common in the 9th century A.D., from which Fleet (JRAS 1912, 1045 f.) has concluded that the work was written for the first time after the 9th century A.D. Winternitz believes that it follows also from the 7th story of book, I, where Gaurī is worshipped with little girls, therefore, which presupposes the tantric cult of Śakti. This cult is nowhere mentioned in older Sanskrit literature. Hertel (Pañcatantra, p. 39 f.) deduces from the same story that Bengal was the original place of the Hitopadeśa, since this cult is indigenous there.

1. Hertel had drawn the attention of Winternitz to the fact that Nārāyaṇa alone had not altered the order of the first two books, but this had already taken place in the arch-type of the Nepal-recension and in the Hitopadeśa. See Hertel, Das Pañcatantra, p. 37 f.

2. The beginning and the end of each of these books contain the conversation between the teacher Viṣṇuśarman and the princes (that occurs only in the Kathāmukha in all the other recensions of the Pañcatantra), and each of the four books ends in a benedictory stanza, in which Śiva is honoured. Notwithstanding his name, (Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu) the author must have been a devotee of Śiva.

3. The story of Vīravara has probably been taken from the Vetālapañcaviṁśati 4. The story (II, 6) of the woman, who is attracted to the son of a village-magistrate and whom with her cunning she hits in the presence of his father, who too is her lover, and in front of her own husband, has its proper place in the Śukasaptati. The story of the sly procuress (I, 7) occurs also in the book of Sindbad. Cf. Benfey I, 391 who compares also Boccaccio II, 5).

The tale (IV, 5) of the rat, that was turned successively into a cat, a dog and a tiger in order to save its life by a pious hermit, whom it then wants to kill, at which the hermit again turns it into a rat, is probably just a story that is merely a variant of the transformed dog narrated in the Mahābhārata (XII, 116 f.), refashioned by the author himself. Even the recently added fable might have wholly or partly emanated from Nārāyaṇa himself.

The nature of the work as a manual of politics is much more marked in the Hitopadeśa than in any other recension of the original work. There are several long sections in it that are not different from nitiśāstra-quotations in prose as well as in verse. The verses have been taken from Kāmandaki's Nītiśāstra There are numerous epigrams that have been introduced on every appropriate or inappropriate occasion and often form altogether long sections. The Hitopadeśa is equally a collection of epigrams as of stories. But even in the epigrams the political character of the work is visible in a prominent measure[1].

The Hitopadeśa is of Indian literature in Europe that have been best known the longest period of time in Europe and it has been repeatedly translated into European languages[2].

We have seen that many a time even the stories composed in popular dialects as also narrative works were utilized as source-materials for later recensions of the Pañcatantra. Reversely the Pañcatantra has been repeatedly rendered into popular languages and these have become new recensions of the work. A Hindī-translation of the old Pañcatantra was already known to the Arabic tourist Alberuni in the beginning

1. Of the 600 epigrams (that is to say that are neither narrative stanzas nor benedictory verses) 273 have political ideas, 222 concern common worldly wisdom and only 105 have a moral or religious theme.

2. German translation of Max Müller (Leipzig 1844), I. Schoenberg (Wien 1884), L. Fritze (Leipzig 1888), J. Hertel (Reclam. Univ.-Bibl. (1895). The earliest translation in European languages (London 1787) and into French by L. Langlés (Paris 1790). According to Wilkins, Herder had translated a number of epigrams in the "Gedanken einiger Brahmanen". Rückert has poetically reproduced the fable of the out and out greedy jackal (I, 6) in the "brahmanischen Erzählungen". On the translations (and recensions H of the Hitopadeśa in Western and Eastern languages, see Hertel, Das Pañcatantra p. 43 ff., and ZDMG 72, 62 ff.; 74, 95 ff. and 75, 129 ff.).

of the 11th century[1]. Since the Pañcatantra-recensions redacted by the Jainas originated in Gujarāt, the main domicile of the Jainas, and were mostly enlarged here, it is no wonder that there are numerous redactions in the Gujarātī language. In South India too there are numerous translations in popular languages : Telugu, Kanarese, Tamil, Malayālam and Modi[2]. The Malaya recension made by the Malāyan scholar Abdullah Bin Abdelkader Munshi[3] is based on the Tamil version made in 1835 by Pandja Tandaram[3]. The Hitopadeśa has been repeatedly translated also into modern Indian languages; thus in Bengali, Braj Bhākhā, Gujarātī, Hindī, Hindustānī, Marāṭhī and Newārī[4].

The Pañcatantra in World Literature

In the famous introduction to his translation of the Pañcatantra Th. Benfey has shown how this old Indian book impregnated the literatures of three continents of the globe[5] for many centuries and particularly influenced the European narrative literature of the whole of the Middle Age in an extraordinary measure. With his marvellous extensive study into a large number of the different languages of the East and the West Benfey has combined his admirable sagacity, and has succeeded in pursuing through the world literature the

1. Hertel, Pañcatantra, p. 69.

2. Hertel (Pañcatantra, p. 121 ff.) treats in detail verses of the Pañcatantra found in Gujarātī, in Marāṭhī (ibid p. 254) and in South Indian Languages (ibid, p. 291 ff).

3. Hertel, ibid p. 294 ff.

4. Hertel, ibid p. 48 ff. Many Pañcatantra-stories or parallels to these are found also in the modern Indian folk-tales, e.g. B. M. Stokes, Indian Fairy Tales, Calcutta 1879.

5. The Indian narrative themes (such as the fables of the donkey without heart and ears, of the monkey and the sea-animal, of the crow and the owls) are found even in the homes of the Suahelis in East Africa. Cf. R. O. Franke, WZKM 7, 1893, p. 215, 384 f., and R. Köhler (Kleinere Schriften I, 514 ff. In W. H. J. Bleek, Reineke Fuchs in Afrika, Fabeln und Märchen der Eingeborenen (Weimer 1870), we find also some Indian fables (for example the story of the jackal, who does not go to the sick lion in the cave, because he saw only the trace of going inward and not one of coming outward, p. 15 f), but most of these African stories are originally animal-tales, with which have been mixed up here and there a number of animal fables, going back to European, Indian and Mohammadan sources.

history of a large number of Indian stories and motives[1]. He was actually able to trace the Indian source of so many stories[2], and so he candidly advanced the theory that India was the land of tales and stories, whilst he believed to have found the homeland of the fables in Greece and assumed that the India had borrowed them from the Greece. Since he believed to have been able to prove further that the great majority of stories of the Pañcatantra had Buddhistic origin, he presumed that the Buddhists had mainly contributed towards wide circulation of these stories.

All these conclusions of Benfey, in the form, in which he has stated them, deserve to be rejected outright as untenable. It has already been shown that the stories of the Pañcatantra are not of Buddhistic origin. However, now-a-days nobody considers India to be the home-land of all tales and stories or in any case, speaking generally, nobody regards any one particular country as the home of all tales and stories. As fantasy is a common property of mankind, so is the fancy for hearing and narrating stories common human nature. Today it is like struggling against the wind to attempt to prove that all tales, fables and stories, that we know about the different nations of the East, originated in India[3]. But this common human fancy

1. Max Koch, the founder of the "Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte (I, 1887, p. 6) too admits that Benfey laid the foundation of "the comparative literary history" with his "Pantschatantra". On Benfey's Pañcatantra, see also F. Liebrecht in the Jahrbuch für romanische und englische litteratur 3, 1861, 74ff., 146 ff.

2. F. von der Leyen, Das Märchen, Leipzig 1911, p. 103 ff. gives a resumé of narrative motives, that are certainly or apparently of Indian origin. Leyen, p. 125 has precisely established that Grimm's tales are wholly or partly of Indian origin.

3. It is amazing that not only J. Bédier (Les fabliaux, études de litérature populaire, Bibl. de l' École des Hautes Études, t. 98, Paris 1893 3 éme Éd. 1911), but W. Wundt (Völkerpsychologie, II, 1, 340 ff. and A. Forke (Die indischen Märchen und ihre Bedeutung für die vergleichende Märchenforschung, Berlin 1911) too should have believed to be carrying this struggle against wind. In any case we will have probably to distinguish between animal-tales and animal-fables, as probably on the whole between tales and fables. Animal-tales, that is to say wonderful narratives about animals, certainly belong to the common heritage of mankind. The animal-fables, that is to say, those animal-stories, that have been invented for the purpose of giving moral lessons, as "examples" or as "similes", however, may have probably originated in some particular country. In fact we find animal-fables in homes of the uncivilised people of Africa, but of course only in such homes in which contact with Indians, Christians or Muhammadans is partly not prohibited, and partly proved.

for fabulisation directly brings with itself the idea that all nations and all men are determined to adopt willingly and quickly strange stories, to hear them and to circulate them further. So much more this is the case that there cannot be even a doubt that the capacity of man to invent stories stands in no relation to his desire for hearing and narrating them. The human power of invention in this respect is limited, and all persons do not have it in equal measure, whilst the pleasure of narration is unlimited. Hence it comes that a good story once told acquires such a vitality, that throughout centuries it continues to be repeatedly ever told and spreads over wider and wider geographical regions. This too is possible that the circumstances for invention of stories are more favourable to the people of one country than those of the people of other countries, and that in respect of exchange of stories on a mass scale, that took place between the peoples of different centuries, one race might have contributed more than another. And since it seems undoubtful that in India there was an especially favourable soil, particularly for invention of fables, animal-stories and tales. We may refer only to the Indian theory of transmigration of soul, that directly obliterates the distinction between man and animal, and this seemed so natural that animals were made the heroes of stories[1]. We may refer further to the exceedingly luxuriant Indian phantasy that was never satisfied in introducing in stories sub-human and under-human beings —even in the creative art too—knew no limits or measure. Lastly it may be pointed out that in India there were in all times numberless idlers. Thousands of ascetics, mendicants and pilgrims have been wandering there throughout cities and villages since centuries ago, and they have always liked to attract the people towards themselves by telling them stories and to while away their own time in narrating among themselves stories, that have not always been religious.

Yet another fact, that might have been the cause, is that hardly any people have such a rich story-literature as the Indians have and that actually Indian narrative works as a whole, not merely individual stories or individual motif, are

1. Hertel (Bunte Geschichten vom Himalaya, p. XVIII f.) decidedly goes too far, when he means "that animal-stories could develop only on the soil of this way of thinking about the world".

found in literatures of other countries. And this too is a fact that very often we are able to trace the way through which Indian fables and tales have in course of their journey entered into the world. Although many of the statements of Benfey stand be refuted today, still many of the results of his researches there remain correct, and in reference to many of the points even now we cannot go further than Benfey[1].

But the most important work of the Indian narrative literature, in any case, is undisputedly the Pañcatantra for the literature of the world. As stated above, the fame of this work had already in the sixth century A. D. spread as far as Persia. Then a North-Western recension of the work, with certain other Indian texts, was rendered into Pahlavi, the middle Persian literary language under a command of the Persian king Chosrau Anōscharwān (531-579 A. D.) by Arzt Burzōe. Unfortunately this translation is lost to us, but an old Syriac version as well as an old Arabic rendering from Pahlavi is still preserved, and they allow us to draw our conclusion with regard to the Pahlavi text. Already in about 570 A. D. the famous Syrian priest and writer, Būd by name, actually translated the book under the title "Kalilag and Damanag" from Pahlavi into Syriac. Unfortunately this translation is preserved with long gaps in it and that incompletely, particularly the beginning is wanting. More than full, that is to say enlarged by interpolations is the Arabic translation written in about 750 A. D. by Abdallah ibn al-Moqaffa with the title "Kalīla and Dimna[2]". This

1. F. von der Leyen (Festschrift Kuhn p. 404) says that it confirms "the irrefutable cognition that the tales that are often narrated even today and which circulate most widely are available in their original form in India". The researches of Gaston Paris and especially of Antti Aarne and Emmanuel Cosquin have once more proved that the oldest of these tales are best preserved in mostly finished forms in India, and there tradition is the richest......The theory of Benfey, that is so hasty and often so unintelligibly disputed, assumes their revival and their currency till modern days in refined forms". He believes in many cases to have been able to trace their "original foım" in the Indian tales, which can no more be proved to be existing among the tales of other countries. However, it is doubtful that the science in regard to this "original form" will ever come to be more than a vague presumption.

2. "Kalilag and Damnag" or "Kalīla and Dimna" are corrupt forms of the names Karaṭaka and Damanaka, the two jackals of the first book of the Pañcatantra (see Benfey I, 34 f.). In all probability this first book this special bore title, which was made the appellation of the

Arabic translation was the source, from which have sprung up numerous translations in European and Asian languages so much so that Ph. Wolff, the German translator of the book, was able to remark that it was "probably next to the Bible, translated into the largest number of languages of the world" and called it a book "that inspired the entire mankind and which was held in respect by kings and princes and to which they lent their attention[1]. So rightly Max Müller[2] says : "The history of march of Indian tales from the East towards the West is indeed wonderful, more wonderful and more instructive than many of the stories themselves."

Benfey had already admitted that the Pahlavi translation stood closer to the original recension of the Pañcatantra, the "primary work" than the only Sanskrit text known in his time. However, he went too far when he tried to derive from it his conclusions with regard to original volume of the "primary work." The Pahlavi-translation comprehends, of course, not only the five books of the Pañcatantra, but also other five of the apparently further eight chapters, that contain other Indian stories, and two more chapters, of which the one contains the story of Būrzoe's expedition[3] and the other the introduction by Burzōe[4].

---

whole book by the Pahlavi translation. The Syriac translation was first translated and published by G. Bickell (Leipzig 1876) and has recently been brought out by F. Schulthess (Berlin 1911). The old Arabic translation has been published by Silvestre de Sacy (Calilah et Dimna ou Fables de Bidpai en Arabe, précédées d'un mémoire sur l'origine de ce livre, Paris 1816). On this edition is based the German translation of Philipp Wolff (Calila und Dimna oder die Fablen Bidpais, das Buch des Weisen in lust-und lehrreichen Erzählungen des indisches Philosophen Bidpai aus dem Arabischen, 2. Aufl., Stuttgart 1839). Other translations from the Arabic text into German, Danish, English, French and Rassian are mentioned by Hertel, Pañcatantra, p. 393. On Ibn Moquaffa see also Th. Nöldeke, ZDMG 59, 1905, 794 ff.

1. Victor Chauvin has given a complete list from almost unsurveyable literature on the translations and translations of translations of the "Kalila and Dimna" in vol. II of his "Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes" (Liege and Leipzig 1897). Here he gives *inter alia* a list of 40 languages into which this work has been translated. See also Hertel, Pañcatantra p. 357 ff. According to Hertel (p. 451 f.) there are translations of the Pañcatantra and "Kalila and Dimna" in 15 Indian, 15 other Asian, 2 African and 22 European languages.

2. Essays III, 303 ff.

3. From Arabic translated by F. Schulthess in Hertel, Tantrākhyāyika, Übersetzung I, 45 ff.

4. Cf. Benfey I, 74 ff and Th. Nöldeke, Burzōes Einleitung zu dem Buch Kalīla wa Dimna übersetzt und erläutert, Strassburg 1912. All sorts of Indian parables, those of the "man in the well" have been assimilated in this introduction.

found in literatures of other countries. And this too is a fact that very often we are able to trace the way through which Indian fables and tales have in course of their journey entered into the world. Although many of the statements of Benfey stand be refuted today, still many of the results of his researches there remain correct, and in reference to many of the points even now we cannot go further than Benfey[1].

But the most important work of the Indian narrative literature, in any case, is undisputedly the Pañcatantra for the literature of the world. As stated above, the fame of this work had already in the sixth century A. D. spread as far as Persia. Then a North-Western recension of the work, with certain other Indian texts, was rendered into Pahlavi, the middle Persian literary language under a command of the Persian king Chosrau Anōscharwān (531-579 A. D.) by Arzt Burzōe. Unfortunately this translation is lost to us, but an old Syriac version as well as an old Arabic rendering from Pahlavi is still preserved, and they allow us to draw our conclusion with regard to the Pahlavi text. Already in about 570 A. D. the famous Syrian priest and writer, Būd by name, actually translated the book under the title "Kalilag and Damanag" from Pahlavi into Syriac. Unfortunately this translation is preserved with long gaps in it and that incompletely, particularly the beginning is wanting. More than full, that is to say enlarged by interpolations is the Arabic translation written in about 750 A. D. by Abdallah ibn al-Moqaffa with the title "Kalīla and Dimna[2]". This

1. F. von der Leyen (Festschrift Kuhn p. 404) says that it confirms "the irrefutable cognition that the tales that are often narrated even today and which circulate most widely are available in their original form in India". The researches of Gaston Paris and especially of Antti Aarne and Emmanuel Cosquin have once more proved that the oldest of these tales are best preserved in mostly finished forms in India, and there tradition is the richest......The theory of Benfey, that is so hasty and often so unintelligibly disputed, assumes their revival and their currency till modern days in refined forms". He believes in many cases to have been able to trace their "original form" in the Indian tales, which can no more be proved to be existing among the tales of other countries. However, it is doubtful that the science in regard to this "original form" will ever come to be more than a vague presumption.

2. "Kalilag and Damnag" or "Kalīla and Dimna" are corrupt forms of the names Karaṭaka and Damanaka, the two jackals of the first book of the Pañcatantra (see Benfey I, 34 f.). In all probability this first book this special bore title, which was made the appellation of the

Arabic translation was the source, from which have sprung up numerous translations in European and Asian languages so much so that Ph. Wolff, the German translator of the book, was able to remark that it was "probably next to the Bible, translated into the largest number of languages of the world" and called it a book "that inspired the entire mankind and which was held in respect by kings and princes and to which they lent their attention[1]. So rightly Max Müller[2] says: "The history of march of Indian tales from the East towards the West is indeed wonderful, more wonderful and more instructive than many of the stories themselves."

Benfey had already admitted that the Pahlavi translation stood closer to the original recension of the Pañcatantra, the "primary work" than the only Sanskrit text known in his time. However, he went too far when he tried to derive from it his conclusions with regard to original volume of the "primary work." The Pahlavi-translation comprehends, of course, not only the five books of the Pañcatantra, but also other five of the apparently further eight chapters, that contain other Indian stories, and two more chapters, of which the one contains the story of Būrzoe's expedition[3] and the other the introduction by Burzōe[4].

whole book by the Pahlavi translation. The Syriac translation was first translated and published by G. Bickell (Leipzig 1876) and has recently been brought out by F. Schulthess (Berlin 1911). The old Arabic translation has been published by Silvestre de Sacy (Calilah et Dimna ou Fables de Bidpai en Arabe, précédées d'un mémoire sur l'origine de ce livre, Paris 1816). On this edition is based the German translation of Philipp Wolff (Calila und Dimna oder die Fablen Bidpais, das Buch des Weisen in lust-und lehrreichen Erzählungen des indisches Philosophen Bidpai aus dem Arabischen, 2. Aufl., Stuttgart 1839). Other translations from the Arabic text into German, Danish, English, French and Rassian are mentioned by Hertel, Pañcatantra, p. 393. On Ibn Moquaffa see also Th. Nöldeke, ZDMG 59, 1905, 794 ff.

1. Victor Chauvin has given a complete list from almost unsurveyable literature on the translations and translations of translations of the "Kalīla and Dimna" in vol. II of his "Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes" (Liege and Leipzig 1897). Here he gives *inter alia* a list of 40 languages into which this work has been translated. See also Hertel, Pañcatantra p. 357 ff. According to Hertel (p. 451 f.) there are translations of the Pañcatantra and "Kalila and Dimna" in 15 Indian, 15 other Asian, 2 African and 22 European languages.

2. Essays III, 303 ff.

3. From Arabic translated by F. Schulthess in Hertel, Tantrākhyāyika, Übersetzung I, 45 ff.

4. Cf. Benfey I, 74 ff and Th. Nöldeke, Burzōes Einleitung zu dem Buch Kalīla wa Dimna übersetzt und erläutert, Strassburg 1912. All sorts of Indian parables, those of the "man in the well" have been assimilated in this introduction.

According to him the whole work had ten chapters, that were contained in the Syriac translation, but apparently from 15 chapters, that must have been really taken from the 22 chapters of the Arabic translation. Probably Burzōe had before him a codex, in which, to the Pañcatantra, were added other similar stories, or he, with the help of his Indian friends, following whom he had translated the Pañcatantra, added a number of chapters from other Indian books. There his intention seems to be to collect in his book not only the stories that might serve as suitable "mirrors for princes", for teaching them the art of government and worldly wisdom, but also to include in it a number of moral stories.[1] Thereupon the sentence containing a statement about the intention of Burzōe indicates that Anōsharwān passionately wished that this book should be not only the root of all culture and sum total of all wisdom and a guide to every kind of profitable work"[1], but would serve also as a key in the pursuit to the other world and as instrument of saving oneself from its horrors"[2], and would be so potent that kings would utilize it in administration of their kingdoms and thereby they would lead their life in the right direction"[3]. Although the Pahlavi translation has its importance for the history of the text of the Pañcatantra, its chief credit lies, however, in the fact that it was the starting point for enlargement of the Pañcatantra and that the contents of its stories were set according to the methods of the West. The Arabic translation of the Pahlavi text was the source, from which sprang all the subsequent translations and adaptations in the languages of Europe and Asia either directly or indirectly. The book was directly translated from Arabic (probably already in the 10th

---

1. Thereby the character of the work is strictly paraphrased as that of an arthaśāstra.

2. This does not take any notice of the contents of Pañcatantra, but probably it hints at some of the Buddhist stories contained in the Pahlavi text.

3. Therefore, the book is appropriately considered also as the "nītiśāstra", a work on "rājanīti". The Syriac as well as the Arabic translation adds to the five books of the Pañcatantra three chapters from the Mahābhārata (XII, 138, 13 ff; 139, 47 ff.; 111, 3 ff), that too contain nītiśāstra-stories (see Benfey, I, 541 ff.). On the chapters of the Pahlavi translation not belonging to the Pañcatantra, see Hertel, Pañcatantra, p. 366 ff. and Benfey I, 6f., 57 ff. 74 ff, 585 ff.

or in the 1 century) once more in Syriac[1]. At the end of the 11th century Symeon, son of Seth, translated the book from Arabic into Greek, under the title Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης: The Protector and the Investigator (based on a wrong interpretation of the Arabic name Kalila and Dimna). On this Greek text are based the Italian translation of Giulio Nuti (Ferrara 1583), two Latin, one German and several Slav. translations. Of the highest importance is the old Hebrew translation of Rabbi Joël (beginning of the 12th century), that is unfortunately preserved in a single incomplete manuscript[2]. A Latin translation of this Hebrew text was done by Jew Johannes von Capua, a Christian convert, under the title "Liber Kalilae et Dimnae, Directorium vitae humanae"[3] between 1263 and 1278 A.D. In about 1480 A.D. there appeared two printed editions of this text, that were based on a bad manuscript. On a batter manuscript is based the famous German translation of Anton von Pforr, who under orders of Count Eberhart at Barte in Württemberg translated it from Latin. Under the title "Das Buch der Beispiele der alten Weisen" is the work that has been repeatedly printed in Germany since 1483, and for a long time this translation has contributed the most towards our knowledge of this work. It has not only influenced German literature in many ways[4], but it has been also translated into Danish, Islandic and Dutch. Benfey praises it for its merits as "the most reliable mirror" of the Arabic translation[5].

---

1. Kalilah and Dimnah or the Fables of Bidpai, being an account of their literary history, with an English translation of the later Syriac version of the same, by J. G. N. Kieth-Falconer, Cambridge 1885.

2. Edited by J. Derenbourg with French translation (1881). The tenth chapter has been edited and translated into German by A. Neubauer in Benfey's "Orient und Occident" I, 481 ff., 657 ff.

3. Edited by J. Derenbourg, Paris 1887.

4. Hans Wilh. Kirchhof has borrowed almost complete stories n his "Wendunmuth", and some of them have been taken into "Schimpf und Ernst" of Pauli. According to Benfey (I, 107, 139f., 179 ff., 224f.) the popular epic "Reineke Fuchs", in case it does not owe its origin to "Kalila und Dimna.', was at least influenced by it. Likewise O. Keller, (Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der griechischen Fabel, Leipzig 1862, p. 320 ff.) and Müllenhoff (Zeitschr. f. deutsches Altertum N. F. 6, 1875, p. I ff.). J. Grimm (Reinhart Fuchs, Berlin 1834, p. CCLXXII ff., CCLXXIX) explains the correspondences between the German animal epics and the Indian fables as "an irremovability of the residue of the akinness of the German and the Indian people".

5. On the merits of the German translation in comparison with the original Latin see Benfey, I, 96 and "Orient und Occident" I, 1860, 138 ff. Winternitz knew about the "Buch der Weissheynt der Alten weisen", in the editions Strassburg 1545 and Frankfurt am Mayn 1565 and 1583.

Based on the Latin text of Johannes von Capua along with the German translation of Pforr is the Spanish translation[1], printed in 1493 A.D. at Saragossa. A free Italian imitation of this Spanish translation is the "Discorsi degli animali ragionanti tra loro" of Agnolo Firenzuola, that appeared first in 1548, and was translated into French in 1556. In 1552 was published the Italian translation of Doni in two parts. The first part was translated into English under the title "The Morall Philosophie of Doni" (London 1570 and 1601) by Thomas North.

A second Hebrew translation from Arabic by Jacob ben Eleazar belongs to the 13th century A. D. Only the first half of the work is available[2]. More important is the properly set Persian translation under the title Kitāb Kalīla wa Dimna of Abu'l - Maālī Naṣrallāh ibn Muhammed ibn 'Abdal-Ḥamīd made in about 1142 A. D. On this translation are based several East Turkish translations and adaptations, but the one that is known under the title Anwāri Suhailī[3] acknowledges the Persian rendering by Ḥusain ibn 'Alī al-Wā'iz [1470-1505]. It is a well-known work of Persian ornate poetry. Its style is extremely artificial and ornamented, although Ḥusain says that his intention is to simplify the style of the original work. This work is the source from which have sprung up the numerous retranslations into European and Asian languages. In the East it has been translated into Turkish, Danish Georgian, Icelandic and in several modern Indian languages. In Europe it came to be known through the French translation of David Sahid and Gaulmin, that was published for the first time in 1644 in Paris under the title "Livre des lumières ou la Conduite des roys" and was very soon rendered into Swedish, English and several times into German. The book Anwāri Suhaili got wider

1. The Czec translation of Nikolaus Konáč (1540) was prepared on the basis of the Latin translation of Johannes von Capua. Cf. Hertel, Pañcatantra, p. 399 f., and V. Lesný in WZKM 30, 1917-18, p. 338 ff.

2. Edited by Derenbourg, together with Joël's translation. Cf. M. Steinschneider, ZDMG 27, 1873, 553 ff.

3. Translated from Persian into English by E. B. Eastwick, Hertford 1854. Cf. Benfey, I, 84 ff and Kleinere Schriften II, 42 ff. The title means "Lights of Kanōpus". The work is so named, according to Aḥmad Suhailī, Wazīr of Sultān Ḥusain Mīrzā of Khurāsān (1470-1505).

circulation through its Turkish translation under the title Humāyūn Nāmeh, "the emperor's book[1]" by 'Alī-bin Ṣāliḥ and was dedicated to Sultan Sulaimān I (1512-1520). Galland and Cardonne translated the book into French from Turkish, and this French translation has further been translated into German, Dutch, Hungarian and also into Malayan.

Directly springing from to the Arabic translation of the "Kalīla wa Dimna" is also the old Spanish translation (probably dated 1251 A.D.). The Liber de Dina et Kalila of Raimundus de Biterris (Raimonds de Bézier) is partly based on the Liber Kalilae et Dimnae of Johannes von Capua and partly on this Spanish translation. The author says that he has written the book at the command of Queen Johanna of Novarra on the basis of the Spanish manuscript and has added to in it verses, epigrams and other things. Most of the fables of in "Novus Esopus" of the Italian Baldo, who wrote them in the first half of the 12th century A.D., go back to an unknown recension of the "Kalīla and dimna"[2].

Partly on the "Kalīla wa Dimna" and partly on the South Indian recension of the Pañcatantra are lastly based also two Malayan books of fables, whilst the other Indo-Chinese and Indonesian recensions are directly based on the Pañcatantra[3].

When, therefore, we see how through the "Kalīla wa Dimna" the Pañcatantra found its way, towards the West it is no wonder that we find traces of Indian fables and tales

1. Fabeln und Parabeln des Orients, der türkischen Sammlung Humajún name entnommen und in Türkische übertragen von Souby Bey, Mit einem Vorwort von Rieder Pascha, Berlin 1903.

2. Hertel, Pañcatantra, p. 363 ff., 400 f., 412 f.

3. On Tamil-Malay versions of Pandja Tandaram and Abdullah Bin Abdelkader Munshi, see above p. 329. On the Siamese Nouthuk pakaraṇa, see A. Bastian in "Orient und Occident III, 479 ff., on the Laotion Mulla Tantai, see J. Brengues and J. Hertel in JA 1908, Nov, Déc. 357 ff. The Siamese Paksi Pakaranam, 'Book of Birds", is an imitation of the Pañcatantra (cf. Bastian, ibid 171 ff. and Hertel, Pañcatantra 338 ff.). The Siamese books of fables do not contain fables from the Pañcatantra alone, but also from the Vetālapañcaviṁśati and other works. See A. Bastian, Geographische und ethnologische Bilder, Jena 1873, p. 248 ff. Also in the collection of the Malayan fables and tales of W. Skeat (Fables and Folk-tales from an Eastern Forest, London 1901; cf. Winternitz in the "Globus", Bd. 83, 1903, p. 113) we find a number of tales that are known also in the Pañcatantra.

in the most popular narrative works of the middle ages[1], like the "Gesta Romanorum", in the French Fabliaux, in the main narrative classics, like Boccaccio and Straparola, Chaucer and Lafontaine[2] and also in the children and domestic tales of Brother Grimm. As in India, so also outside India, these tales of the Pañcatantra and with them other Indian tales and motives too have repeatedly penetrated from literature into society and again have entered into literature from popular traditions, naturally not having often remained unaltered in course of transmission. By the side of the literary tradition, the oral transmission has not played an insignificant rôle, in which intercourse of the Christians of the Western countries with the Muhammadans and with their Oriental co-religionists during the period of the Crusade and also during the period of the Arab rule in Spain, likewise the rôle of mediation played by the Jews between the Arabs and the people of the West[3] have had their parts.

In any case, we can become sure about the Indian origin of a tale only when we have actually gone through the translations of the Indian work like the Pañcatantra and its out-lets. And it is often very interesting to be able to point to the Indian

1. The first book of the Middle Ages, that shows the influence of oriental narrative literature, is the "Disciplina clericalis" of Petrus Alphonsus (born in about 1062 as a Jew, and in 1106 converted to Christianity), see A. Wesselski, Mönchslatein, Leipzig 1909, p. XIX f. The year of birth of Petrus Alphonsi (to be so read, scil. filius spiritualis) is not known, the year 1062 is wrong. (communication by Zachariae).

2. In the second edition of his fables, that appeared in the year 1678, Lafontaine, in his foreword says that he was indebted to the greatest extent to the "Indian Philosopher Pilpay" for the new tales that were added into the second edition.

3. Cf. Benfey I, 26. H. von Wlislocki, ZDMG 41, 1887, 448 f; 42, 113 f. has proved the Gypsies to be the intermediary between the Indians and the people of the western countries; E. Kuhn, in the Byzantinischen Zeitschrift 4, 1895, 241 ff., has proved the part of the intermediary played by the Byzantine literature between the oriental and occidental fiction-materials. Benfey (I. S. XXIV) has also assumed that the Mongols had contributed towards circulation of the Indian, particularly the Buddhist, tales in the West, partly in their campaigns for conquest and partly in their way to Russia. This had been indeed disputed by E. Cosquin (Les Mongols et leur prétendu rôle dans la transmission des contes indiens vers l'occident Européen, Niort 1913, Extrait de la Revue des Traditions Populaires, Année 1912), but it has not been yet fully set aside. The assumption of Benfey holds good not only to limited extent he believed. Cf. also Wlislocki in ZDMG 41, 1887, 460, [H. Warren, Het indische origineel van den Griekschen Syntipas; Hertel, ZDMG LXXIV, 458ff., and Kieth, HSL, p. 359 f.].

origin of tales, notwithstanding the fact that the respective stories have already become so deeprooted in Europe that they have assumed the unmistakable local colouring of their new homes. A pair of examples may suffice to prove this statement :

When several years ago W. was travelling in North Wales and was going about the place known as Beddgelert, surrounded by rings of wonderfully beautiful hills, he was struck in an unusual manner, when he read the story in his "Führer", that had provided the name of the place and in it he found again the well-known Indian story. It is the tale of Llewelyn (c. 1205) and his little pet dog Gelert. One day when he returns home from the hunt, the dog comes to him rejoicingly waving his tail, but his snout is besmeared with blood. Llewelyn anxiously rushes forth into his house, finds the cradle of his baby turned down and sees blood-marks near about. He at once comes to believe that the dog has killed his child, takes out his sword and strikes him. Thereupon he turns the cradle up and finds his baby fast asleep and a dead wolf by his side—that had obviously been killed by his dog with the intention of saving the child. Full of remorse Prince Llewelyn gets his dog engraved and gets a monument constructed there : hence the name Beddgelert, i.e. "the grave Gelert". There is the proverb still current in Wales that means : "He regrets like the man who killed his dog."

Who will not believe that here we have before us an original tale ? However, it is nothing but the Indian story that has travelled from India to Wales, that forms the frame of Book V of the Pañcatantra, only with this alteration that here we have a mongoose in place of the dog and a snake in place of the wolf, and it is not a prince, but a Brāhmaṇa, who kills his innocent mongoose. In a Mongolian version the unfortunate animal is a polecat, but in the Syriac "Sindbad"[1], a dog has already come into its place. Again the French monk Jean de Haute-Scille has reset poetically the legend in his "Dolopathos sive de rege et septem sapientibus" of a Latin redaction of "the Seven Wise Masters". Étienne de Bourbon, a

1. Sindban, Syrisch und Deutsch by Baethgen, p. 25 f.

Christian priest of the 13th century A.D., who narrates that in the Diocese of Lyon many women, after a sermon about superstitions in confession, admitted that they had taken their children to St. Guinefort, proves the depth which the legend had got seated among the people in Europe. On inquiry, however, he came to know that it was simply an innocent hunt dog, who was killed and was honoured as a martyr by peasants, and at whose place of burial the mothers had the tendency to take their sick or weak children. The legend reported by him is the same as the one of Llewelyn and his dog[1]. The oldest datable version of the story, however, seems to be found in the Vinaya of Mahāsāṅghika, translated into Chinese in 416 A.D.[2] and this substantially agrees with the Pañcatantra.

Another example of a widely circulated story is the already referred to interpolated story of air-castle-builder, the "father of Somas' arman" in the Tantrākhyāyika: A Brāhmaṇa very often gets as sacrificial fee some barley-flour from a shop-keeper. He keeps it in a jar with care, and in course of time that becomes full. He hangs the jar to a peg near his bed. One morning he wakes up and goes into reveree: 'The flour, I shall sell for twenty rupees,

1. Cf. A. Wesselski, Mönchslatein, p. XXVIII ff.; Benfey I, 473 ff., 479.; Bloomfield, JAOS 36, 1916, 63. The Mongolian version in Bergmann, Nomadische Streiferien I, 103, and Benfey, Kleinere. Schriften II, 39 ff. On venerable St. Guinefort cf. also K. von Hase, Handbuch der protestantischen Polemik, p. 362, cited by Hirtel Hitopadeśa-Übersetzung, p. 171A.

2. Translated from the Chinese Tripiṭaka by Chavannes, Cinq cents contes II, p. 300 ff. Mr. A. Wesselski invited the attention of Winternitz to the story that was narrated by Pausanias (Graeciae descriptio X, 33, 9). F. Liebrecht (Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Litteratur 3, 1861, p. 156), Aug. Marx (Griechische Märchen von dankbaren Tieren und Verwandtes, Stuttgart 1889, p. 119), E. S. Hartland (Folklore 3, 1892, 127 ff.) and J. G. Fraser (Pausanias Transl., London 1898, vol. 5, p. 421 f.) have already pointed to this position. But the only thing that is common to the Greek and Indian stories is that both of them has an animal, that has saved a child, for whose killing he is accused and killed. In all other versions the snake is attacked, whilst in Pausanias the saving animal is hurt. In Indian and in all other stories the child remains alive, but in the Pausanias he is killed with it. Since the book X of the "Beschreibung Griechenlands" was written in between 166 and 180 A.D. (Fraser, ibid., vol. I, p. XVII), it is chronologically older than the Indian stories. But the European stories are closer to the Indian stories than to the Greek. So in case the Indian stories were taken from the Greek stories, even then the European stories go back to the Indian.

with which I shall purchase twenty chickens. They will grow up, and I shall have a flock of hens. With them I shall buy a cow, a horse and a big arable plot of land and lastly I shall get built a beautiful house. Then some Brāhmaṇa, when he will see great wealth, many male and female servants, will surely offer me his daughter to be my wife. From her I shall have a long living healthy boy as my heir. I shall name him a Somaśarman. And when the little boy runs about, the Brāhmaṇī will be all-busy in her work at the time of home-return of cow. Then I, with my heart full of love for my son shall call for her saying: 'you will not be mindful about the care of the boy' and I shall strike her with a stick." At this he strikes with such a force against the jar that it breaks into hundreds of pieces. Covered with flour, all white, he lies there and is laughed at by the people. Who does not find in this story the model of Lafontaine's comic story of the "milkmaid", to which goes back the English proverb; "count not chickens before they are hatched ?[1]

One more example of wide circulation of the epigrams that contain fables *in nuce* is given below. It sounds as cent per cent German when Fischart in the "Geistlichtsklitterung" says; "why do you not lie like the wren, holding its paws above its head, lest the sky may not fall upon it ?" This expression goes back to a fable that was already narrated by Odo von Ceritona (in between 1219 and 1221 A.D.) : "St. Martin's bird in Spain is called a bird, that is small and is of the species of the wren; it has thin long legs that resemble the stalks of reeds. Now one day when it was going to attend the feast of St. Martin,it so happened that in the rays of the sun it fell down near a tree, with its face turned towards the sun and the legs stretched high up in the sky, and said : "by-by, if now the heaven falls down, I shall hold it up on my legs". Then a leaf

1. The form, in which the story is narrated in that of Lafontaine is seen for the first time in the 13th century A. D. in the Christian "Dialogus creaturarum optime moralizatus". Cf. Benfey I, 499 ff.; Max Müller, Essays III, 303 ff. and M. Bloomfield, JAOS 36, 1916, 62 f. The Indian story seems to have been very much changed in the story of "faulen Heinz" (No. 164 of Grimm's "Kinder-und Hausmärchen"). The Indian version is closer to the story of the "Beggar with three jars" of South Hungrian Gypsies (Wlislocki, ZDMG 42, 1888, 136 f.).

dropped down beside it, and frightened at this, it exclaimed :"Saint Martin, why do you not come to help your bird[1]". This bird is found also in the Syriac "Kalilag and Damnag" in an epigram, where four animals are counted that rejoice where there is no ground for rejoicing. The first one is "the bird that flies about in between trees and, when it sleeps on its back, with its feet raised high up, saying, "If the sky falls, I shall hold it up on my feet"[2]. Although this passage is found also in a chapter of the "Kalilag and Damnag", it does not agree with the Pañcatantra; it certainly goes back to the proverb, contained in several recensions of the Pañcatantra of the ṭiṭṭibha-bird, that kept its little feet high up, so that it might not let the sky fall down[3].

Whilst we stand on a more solid ground in case where we can pursue the course of transportation of Indian stories into the literature of the West through translations of works like the Pañcatantra and the "Kalīla and Dimna", in other cases, where we find the same or similar stories, as those found in Indian narrative works, we can, however, just guess whether India is the lender or the borrower. This holds especially good for such fables as Indian and Greek literatures have in common. The fact is that there are such fables in a big number. Yet the figures are manifold over-estimated. Whether all the fables of Aesop are found in India or if all the Indian fables are met with also in Greece : that is no point at all for argument. The

1. Wesselski, Mönchslatein, p. 172 (No. CXXXVII). Almost word for word also in Pauli's "Schimpf und Ernst" (edited by Österly, No. 606) where only the moral of the story is added: "Also sein vil menschen, die meinen wan sie nit weren, so künt man nit hausz halten, etc., there are many people, who think, if they were not their one could not manage his affairs etc."

2. So in the Hebrew translation of Rabbi Joel ("Orient und Occident" I, 671). So also till today in Northern India (See F. Liebrecht, Zur volkskunde, Heilbronn, 1879, p. 103).

3. The passage does not occur in the Tantrākhyāyika, but probably in the textus simplicior (I, 314) and in Pūrṇabhadra I, 329, and indeed as a warning against unfounded arrogance. But apparently it is associated with the fable of the bird ṭiṭṭibha, who threatened the ocean and sought the assistance of Garuḍa (Tantrākhyāyika I, 10), that we are reminded of also by the story of the Saint Martin's bird.

number of fables, such as those of the "Donkey in the Lion's Skin", of the "Donkey without Heart and Ears", of the "Wolf and the Crane" etc., about which we are in a position to safely assert, that once upon a time they originated either in India or in Greece, is limited[1].

With regard to the place of origin of these fables scholars are widely divided in their opinion. There are some, who assert with strong confidence that Greece alone could be their homeland. Besides there are others who likewise affirm that it was only in India where they originated. A. Wagener[2] had derived the Greek fables from those of India. Th. Benfey[3] and A. Weber[4] have pleaded for mutually opposite views, whilst Otto Keller[5] refutes the theory of Indian origin of the fables on the whole, but he with Benfey admits that many fables might have in later ages been first taken from Greece to India. Recently Hertel[6] has advocated most firmly the theory of Indian origin of the fables. But all these researchers have depended on certain basic grounds, that are not sufficient for arriving at a decision with regard to the question. They have either attempted to distinguish out as to which recension of the fable is "more natural", "more naif", "simple" (so Weber), or have taken the position (as Benfey) that the more incomplete form may have been the original: against them there are others who have, on the contrary, held the view that such a form of a fable has the claim to be considered original as is consistent or suits more to the nature of animals that appear in it (so Keller). It is clear that axioms of this type can lead us only to purely subjective conclusion. But the circumstances go against this sort

1. Whilst Joseph Jacobs (ERE Vol. 5, 676 f.) maintains that 56 of the approximately 260 fables, that are found in Latin, are Indian in origin, so he often admits a connection even where one does not exist at all. The remote similarity of a motif or of a story is not sufficient for the purpose of deriving a conclusion of a common origin.

2. Essai sur les rapports qui existent entre les apologues de l'Inde et les apologues de la Grèce (Mémoires couronné et mém. de sav. étrangers, publics par l'academie roy. de sciences . . . de Belgique, t. XXV) Brussells 1854.

3. Pantschatantra I, p. X f., XXI, 102 ff., 170 f., 336 ff., 347, 373 ff., 381 f., 429 ff., 463 etc.

4. Indische Studien III, 327-373.

5. Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der griechischen Fabel (Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie, (Bd. 4), Leipzig 1862, 309-418.

6. ZDMG 57, 1903, 659 ff.; ZVV 16, 1906, 149 ff., 253 ff.

of argumentation, inasmuch as in these fables we have before us only productions of ornate poetry and not those of popular poetry[1].

Unfortunately the question of chronology is not capable of ready solution. Only a few "Aesopean" fables are accurately dated. The beginnings of the Greek animal tales point to Hesiod than in greater extension to Archilochos and to Simonides, whilst their blossoming age is associated with Aesop, who lived in the 5th and 6th centuries B.C. and whom Herodutus calls a fable - poet[2]. But whilst on one hand the type of the fable, as a means of teaching and training, points to have been used in Greece earlier than in India; on the other hand this type appears to have been shaped in an ornate style in India, and particularly in India alone the fable has been used as a means of teaching a wholly definite science of statesmanship and administration. The oldest Indian fables presumably go back to the 4th and 6th centuries B.C. and only a few certainly to the 3rd century B. C. But thence it does not follow that the fables that are common to both Greece and India belong to the oldest Greek fables of the 6th or 5th contury B. C. The good majority of the "Aesopean", like the Indian, fables belong to an age in which the Greek and the Indian were briskly exchanging their ideas[3], and it is like-wise possible that in the very beginning Greek fables came to India and Indian fables went to Greece.

A strong argument in favour of Indian origin of the fable seems to be that the jackal, that in the Indian fable plays the rôle of the fox, follows the track of the lion, in order to while

1. Quite correctly remarks J. J. Meyer (Daśakumāracarita-Übersetzung, Einleitung, p. 118), that the greater or smaller completion of a story does not lend any support to any matter concerning the question of determining whether it occurs in its earlier form here or there, since "certain stories in course of time are smoothed into faultless diamonds, whilst others that were very beautiful originally, crumble away, get disintegrated and deformed with increasing antiquity."

2. H. Flach, Geschichte der griechischen Lyrik, Tübingen 1883/84, II, 577 ff. Cf. Keller, ibid, 381 ff.; u. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendroff in Kultur der Gegenwart I, 8, p. 34.

3. Babrius lived in the 3rd century A. D. According to G. Theile ("Die antike Tierfabel" in "Geisteswissenschaften", I, 433 ff.) the beast-fable indeed goes back to Homer and Hesoid, but it was during the age of the Roman emperors that a class of literature sprang up from them.

away the superfluous part of his meal-time, and thereby easily declares himself to be a companion and minister of the king of beasts, just like the fox of the European fable - a fact that has been stressed by Keller. According to Indian nītiśāstra the minister has to be a model of the cunning. And the cunning of the jackal in the fable would be explained from the fact that in Indian fable-poems he is a typical minister. The fox of the European fable had the same status. So when he comes to occupy the place of the Indian jackal, he owes his wisdom to him[1]. This argument certainly holds good only for the fox-fables and the same cannot be proved in the case of other fables. Hertel has advocated the theory that the political fables are of Indian origin and that they were imported into Greece already at an early age. But in the first place the Aesopean fable is in no way expressly or even essentially "political" fable, and secondly in case Hertel is correct, this will be valid only for the political fables and not for all the fables in general. So Hertel has gone too far when he says that "it is certain that greater part of the best Greek fables have been taken from India[2]". The hypothesis of E. Rohde, that notwithstanding the fact that although these wisdom-poems did not have their earliest source in Greece, still that country had been their place of domicile in any case, that at least such beast-fables found in the Greek version that recur also in Indian collections are extant almost completely in Greece in their original versions and were just thence taken to the oriental countries[3] likewise is of little validity. In the opinion of Winternitz the problem really cannot be solved as a whole but it might have been so for only some such individual cases and in many cases we are obliged to leave it unsolved. Comparison in general can hardly lead us to any conclusion different from this that for centuries together there took place reciprocal and continual

1. Actually neither the jackal nor the fox is particularly wise; see Brehms, Tierleben, 3. Aufl. by Pechuel-Loesche, Säugetieres II, 42 ff., 172 f. In the Mahābhārata XII, 111 the jackal appears as the minister of the tiger, who has the status of the king of beasts.

2. ZDMG 62, 1908 113 ff.; cf. WZKM 24, 1910, 421.

3. "Über griechische Novellendichtung und ihren Zusammenhang mit dem Orient" in the Vorhandlungen der 30. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Rostok 1875, p. 57.

exchange of fables, tales, and stories between Greece and India, as also between India and West-Asia, that the first abode of many fables might have been in India and that of others in Greece[1], and that they have travelled from one place to another like commodities of traders. Although U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff[2] has hypothesised that the real home of the stories that have spread in the Wast and the East might have been "Hellenised East", that in the "Hellenic sea" flew together all the streams of the East and the West and the opposition between the East and the West has got dissolved in "Hellenism", it will be correct only if it is admitted that into this "Hellenic sea" there have flown many streams and rivers, whose source is to be sought in India.

Guṇāḍhya's Bṛhatkathā[3] and the works derived from it.

The poets Daṇḍin, Subandhu and Bāṇa testify that there existed in the 6th century A.D. a work of interesting narrative literature, that was known and had become famous by the name "Bṛhatkathā", a great novel[4]", of which the author is said to be Guṇāḍhya, who is mentioned in a rank of writers like Vyāsa and Vālmīki. The language of this work was not Sanskrit, but the Paiśācī dialect, that is not used in literature. Unfortunately this work has not come

1. It is a pure presumption on the basis of which many scholars believe that the real home of the fables is either Egypt or West Asia, and that they were thence taken to Europe or to India. We cannot deny that this may be probable. But upto the present time evidence in support of this has not been brought forward. Cf. Flach, ibid I, 245 ff.; A. Erman in Deutsche Rundschau 31, 1882, 145; G. Ebers, ibid 23, 1880, 286 f.; Lévi, JA 1909, s. 10, t. XIV, 534; Schulthess, Kalila und Dimna, Übersetzung, p. XVIII.

2. Kultur der Gegenwart I, 8, p. 119 f. Cf also his "Griechische tragödien", I, 106 ff. See also Aug. Hausrath in Pauly-Wissowas Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft VI, 1724 ff. and Philologische Wochenschrift 24, Sept. 1921.

3. Félix Lacôte, Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā, Paris 1908 Cf. J. Charpentier, JA s. 10, t. XVI, 1910, p. 600 ff.; F. D. K. Bosch, de legende van Jīmūtavāhana in de Sanskrit-Litteratuur, Leiden 1914, p. 85 ff.

4. That the word kathā is used in the sense of prose novel is clear from Daṇḍin's Kāvyādarśa I, 38, as also from Subandhu's Vāsavadattā (ed. F.E. Hall), p. 110. So also Lacôte, Essai, p. 282 ff. and Mélanges Lévi, p. 253 ff. Hertel (Tantrākhyāyika I, 41 f., Pañcatantra, p. 30) calls the Bṛhatkathā a "tale-epic" that contained also a "metrical" extract from the Pañcatantra.

down to us in its original form, but it has been transmitted only in its Sanskrit versions, that are probably separated from the original by many centuries. We are able to draw merely probable conclusions in respect of its subject-matter from these later works. An introductory story presumptively describes the life and adventures of Udayana, a king of Vatsa, and those of his wives Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī and the birth of his son Naravāhanadatta. Then the main story describes the adventures of Naravāhanadatta, how he gets a large number of wives and how he becomes the lord of Vidyādharas-half-divine beings, who participate in prosperity and adversity of man more than other divinities do[1]. On the basis of works derived from it, we are able to assume that this story formed the frame in which were fitted many other tales and stories[2]. It is doubtful if the stories of the Pañcatantra and of the Vetālapañcaviṁśati that we find in later redactions of the Bṛhatkathā belonged or not to the original work[3]. If the Bṛhatkathā contained also the story of Udayana, most probably the poet Bhāsa had taken the plot of his famous work of drama from Guṇāḍhya[4], and in that case Guṇāḍhya would have certainly been older than Bhāsa and he would have lived in about the 3rd century A.D. or still earlier.

There is no doubt that there was a poet Guṇāḍhya, since the tradition about him is so definite. But we know

1. On the Vidyādharas, see Lacôte, Essai. 276 ff.

2. This is already pointed to by the title Bṛhatkathā. It might have been a great comprehensive novel, i.e. to say of the type in which many small stories were included.

3. In the opinion of Lacôte, p. 229 it is true that they did not belong to the old Bṛhatkathā. Bosch ibid, p. 43 ff. tries to prove that the Vetālapañcaviṁśati had these already. Subandhu found in the Bṛhatkathā, the stories of Vikramāditya, since Vāsavadattā (ed. Hall, p. 110) contains one sure reference to the story in which a girl was transformed into a statue (see Kathāsaritas. 123, 132 ff.).

4. The argument advanced by Hertel (Jinakīrtis "Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla", p. 153 ff.) against this cannot be proved. Dhanañjaya (Daśarūpa I, 129) advises authors of dramas to fashion their plots on the model of the Rāmāyaṇa, the Mahābhārata and the Bṛhatkathā. Bhāsa had already done it several centuries earlier. Kālidāsa (Meghadūta 1, 30) describes Avantī, as the city where old people narrate the story of Udayana, a thing that is already quoted by Vallabhadeva, the oldest commentator of the Bṛhatkathā. Even the Udenavatthu of the commentator of the Dhammapada (see above, II, 155, transl. p. 194) might have been taken from the Bṛhatkathā, since the story is so little Buddhistic, that it would have hardly originated on the Buddhist soil.

nothing about the poet himself, and a colourful net work of myths has surrounded this name. He possibly was born in Pratiṣṭhāna. There was a city of this name on the Godāvarī in the Deccan, and that was the capital of the Āndhrabhṛtyas or of the Sātavāhanas. Consequently the poet has been made by tradition a minister of one King Sātavāhana. Now Sātavāhana is not the name of one king, but the common name of all the rulers of the Āndhra dynasty[1]. Therefore, it would not be of much help to us in respect of determining the age of Guṇāḍhya, even if the tradition that has made him a minister of Sātavāhana had a historical background. In the opinion of Winternitz, nothing historical can be attributed to these stories, that were narrated for the first time in the 11th century A. D. Probably, however, there was one different Pratiṣṭhāna on the confluence of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā, situated in the neighbour-hood of Kauśāmbī or of Ujjayinī, that had been the actual home of the poet. Since the geography of the Bṛhatkathā (inasmuch as the events are laid not in the region of the heaven, as often is the case) does not point to the South in any way, but to the neighbourhood of Kauśāmbī[2].

From the tradition, that is not contradicted, we learn that Guṇāḍhya wrote a work in a language called "Paiśācī"[3] Daṇḍin has taken this term to mean "the language of goblins". However, the opinions of researchers in regard to the dialect meant by this name are greatly conflicting. The strongest probability is for the hypothesis that it was a North-Western dialect[4]. But still the doubt remains with regarding to the

1. See above, p. 114 f.

2. Cf. Lacôte, Essai, p. 26 ff. The traditions that make Guṇāḍhya a contemporary of the grammarian Pāṇini and Vararuci and of Cāṇakya do not at all have any historical value.

3. In the Kamboj-inscription of the 9th century Guṇāḍhya is mentioned as a "friend of the Prākrit language" (S. Lévi, JA 1885, s. 8 t. VI, 412).

4. Pischel (Deutsche Rundschau 36, 1883, p. 368) believes that the people speaking the "language of the demons" came to be so called because of its roughness or crudeness and that the language stands in close affinity with the Gipsy-dialect and the Dardic languages of the North-West India; see also Pischel, Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen, § 27, and Grierson, Ind. Ant. 30, 1901, 556; ZDMG 66, 1912, p. 49 ff., 67 ff., 74 ff.; Festschrift V. Thomsen, Leipzig 1912, p. 138 ff. Against this Konow ZDMG 64, 1910, 95 ff.; Lacôte, Essais p. 40 ff., 201 ff. (über die spärlichen Fragmente der Paiśācī Bṛhatkathā, die in Hemacandras Prākritgrammatik erhalten sind).

meaning of the word "Paiśācī". It has not yet been possible to say definitely whether it meant the dialect of the Piśācas, either a class of people, who were so called or were nick-named as 'demons', or if it had been named as the "dialect of the demons" either on account of its harsh tone or in opposition to the literary languages. We are not in a position to assume that the Bṛhatkathā either originated or became famous among the wild or half-wild people. In the opinion of Winternitz it is futile to struggle to restore the original work from out of the hitherto known versions[1] and we are able to deduce this much that the Bṛhatkathā was a poetical work that just originated in some circle of finely cultured people and could get appreciation there.

Upto the present day two recensions of the Bṛhatkathā have come to be known: one Kashmirian, that has come down to us in two versified versions (Kṣemendra's Bṛhatkathāmañjarī and Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara) and the other Nepalese that has been transmitted to us (unfortunately incompletely) in a free poetical redaction by Buddhasvāmin. There are other recensions mentioned now and then, but till now they have not been examined closely[2].

There are many points that go to suggest that the

1. One such attempt has been made by Lacôte, Essai 219 ff. In the opinion of W., his effort deserves as much of consideration as those made earlier by Mankowski, ibid and J. S. Speyer (Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara, p. 27 ff.). This is a research made with insufficient materials. In case it be correct that in the 17th century A.D. the grammarian Mārkaṇḍeya had possessed the Paiśācī Bṛhatkathā (Grierson, JRAS, 1913, p. 391), it too may be possible that someday the original may actually is recovered and not deduced.

2. King Durvinīta of the Gaṅgā dynasty probably had already in the 6th century A D. made a Sanskrit translation of the Paiśācī Bṛhatkathā (see. R. Narsimhachar, Ind. Ant. 42, 1913, 204 and JRAS 1913, 389 f. But since the inscription on which he depends for fixing the date of the Gaṅgā dynasty belongs to the class of forged inscriptions, it remains doubtful whether the one found by Narasimhachar has any stronger claim to genuineness than those other inscriptions in which the name of Durvinīta occurs. (Cf. Fleet, Ind. Ant. 30, 1901, 222, Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. VII, App. p. 21; VIII, App, II, p. 4 note). Winternitz says that he is sceptically against the statement of A. Krishnaswāmi Aiyangār (JRAS 1906, 689 ff. and Ancient India, London 1911, p. 328, 337) on a Tamil work Udayanan Kadai or Peruṅgadai, that was probably a literal translation of the Bṛhatakathā and written in 2nd century A. D. On this Tamil version and the Persian version of the Bṛhatkathā see Lacôte, Essai p. 197 ff.

Nepalese recension, that has come down to us just in the form of a torso of the Bṛhatkathā-Ślokasaṅgraha of Buddhasvāmin[1] stands closer to the work of Guṇāḍhya than its Kashmirian version does, even though the difference in time existing between Buddhasvāmin and Guṇāḍhya possibly was very great[2]. The nature of the main story in Buddhasvāmin creates a stronger impression of the work being original than that in the Kashmirian recension. Thus for example Gomukha, who in Buddhasvāmin's work is an interesting character, is just a story-teller in the Kashmirian recension, and it is probable that he has undergone such an alteration, since in this recension the subsidiary stories become more and more important, and the main story of Naravāhanadatta goes into the back-ground. In the Nepalese representation, according to which Kaliṅgasenā, a harlot, and her daughter Madanamañcukā, therefore, of an inferior st tus for Naravāhanadatta, is much more artificial than the correctly twisted narrative of the Kashmirian recension. Also when in the 5th sarga of the Ślokasaṅgraha so much has been said about the artists and the Greek are outright praised as expert artists, who could build the so-called flying machines, which Indian artists could not do, and when in the 18th sarga we hear about the salesman's daughter, whose mother was a Greek woman, they point to the time when Greek artists had become very much famous in North India. In case this was not the age of the Gandhāra art, the period of the 1st century A. D. was the time in which probably Guṇāḍhya's work was written[3].

1. That is named "the great novel, a small compilation in verses" The work was discovered by Haraprasād Śāstrī (JASB 62 1893, 245 f.); cf. Lévi in Comptes Rendus de l' Académie des inscriptions et belles lattres, 1899, pp. 78, 84; Hertel, Südliches Pañcatantra, p. XII ff.; LXXXVII f.; Speyer, Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara, p. 56 ff.; Lacôte, JA 1906, s. 10, t. VII, 19 ff. and Essai p. 146 ff. F. Lacôte has edited with French translation the first nine of the extent 28 cantos (Paris 1908).

2. We do not definitely know the time of Buddhasvāmin. The hypothesis of Lacôte placing him in the 8th or the 9th century is a crude presumption.

3. On the other hand we must not forget that Buddhasvāmin's work is just a small compilation in verses and on account of the versification it has assumed the form of an epic (in sargas), whilst the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya was a prose novel, divided into lambhakas. It is completely impossible to draw a conclusion about the extent of the old Bṛhatkathā,

It is a matter of deep regret that we do not possess the complete work of Buddhasvāmin. There are few books in Indian literature in which humour and mirth in life are so dominent as in the Bṛhatkathā-Ślokasaṅgraha. The actual life of the people is seldom painted in such a gay colour as in this work. Religious festivals and yātrās are described again and again. We meet with remarkable saints like the kāpālikas in canto XXII and descriptions full of instructions taken from the life of the Jainas in canto XXIV. Canto V contains interesting scenes from the life of artists. In canto X graceful Gomukha takes us into the harlot's quarters and into the palace of the famous harlot Kaliṅgasenā[1].

It is very much striking that Buddhasvāmin's work differs so widely from the Kashmirian recension, not only in respect of arrangement of the subject-matter, but also in that of the contents, that in many sections it appears as an entirely different work. It is also remarkable that the title Ślokasaṅgraha is correct just partly. In many places the narrative is so short that it seems to the anticipate in the reader a good knowledge of the story from before. But there are many that are narrated broadly in detail, in a way that it apears as if the poet was more particular about versification (*śloka*) than about compilation (*saṁgraha*). The composition leaves much to be desired for, in which there are episodes that have been put side by side without any consideration of the context.

The introductory stories on Guṇāḍhya found in the Kashmirian recension is missing in the Ślokasaṁgraha. The name Guṇāḍhya occurs only at one place in the extant portion of the work, whilst at one place it is said about a king: "Guṇāḍhya could not sing in his own praise[2]". It is a thing that could hardly be written by an author, who had chosen to

since we have before us only a small portion of Buddhasvāmin's work and probably its beginning is missing (see Speyer, Studies. p. 56 ff.). Hertel (Jinakirtis "Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla", p. 152 ff.) is rather over-confident when he assumes as wholly certain that the Ślokasaṁgraha presents a faithful picture of the Bṛhatkathā.

1. According to Lacôte, Essai, p. 290 the description of the palace of Vasantasenā in the drama Mṛcchakaṭika corresponds to that of the house of Kaliṅgasenā in the Bṛh.-Ślokasaṅgraha (X, 60-163) passage by passage.

2. Lacôte, Essai p. 20.

reproduce the work of Guṇāḍhya in a crude abridged form. This single remark goes to indicate that Buddhasvāmin had become rather an independent poet, who made the work of Guṇāḍhya the basis of his own poem.

The Kashmirian recension of the Bṛhatkathā has come down to us in apparently two different versions, that in a word originated one after the other. The older of the two is the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, "Bud (of the tree) of the Bṛhatkathā" of Kṣemendra, written apparently in about 1037 A.D.[1] As nothing better can be expected from this voluminous writer, he exhibits little taste in his reproduction of the Kashmirian Bṛhatkathā. Though his real intention is to give an abridged version of the work, on one hand he has many a time made his story factually so short that it becomes almost unintelligible, and on the other he is often garrulous and especially delights in painting erotic scenes and in making the religious section, longer and longer—no matter whether it then relates to Śaivism or to Vaiṣṇavism or to Buddhism. Since the primary work is not known, we are not in a position to say whether Kṣemendra or Somadeva presents a more faithful picture of the Bṛhatkathā, that is lost to us[2]. But it is most important for us that neither Somadeva has copied from Kṣemendra, nor the latter from Somadeva, but both of them go back to the same primary work, namely to a Bṛhatkathā-recension that was in circulation in Kashmir and had its volume very much increased with later additions[3].

1. See above, p. 81, note 2. Edited (badly) in Km. 69, 1901. Cf. Bühler, Ind. Ant. 1, 1872, 302 ff.; Lévi, JA 1885, p. 8, t. VI, 397 ff.; 422; 1886, s. 8, t. VII, 216 ff.; Mańkowski ibid; Speyer, Studies p. 9 ff.; 27 ff.; Lacôte, Essai p. 111 f.

2. Lacôte thinks that Kṣemendra, though unimportant as a poet, presents a picture that is more faithful to his model. Mańkowski believes that Somadeva has reproduced a more faithful picture of the subject-matter than has been done by Kṣemendra. Cf. Mańkowski, ibid 167 f. and Hertel, Tantrākhyāyika, Übers. I, 42.

3. Bosch, ibid 83 ff refutes the correctness of the assumption of a Kashmirian recension and assumes that the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī and Somadeva are directly based on Guṇāḍhya's Bṛhatkathā. But since the Bṛhatkathā and the Saritsāgara have so much in common that they absolutely go back to the same source, but the Brh.-Ślokasaṁgraha differs very widely from both the works, that we can hardly find a connecting link between them. In case Grierson be right, Paiśācī stands sufficiently close to the dialect of Kashmir, so that the Kashmirian recension may be designated as the "Paiśācī Bṛhatkathā. On Paiśācī see also Konow, JRAS

Since Somadeva, wrote his work in between 1063 and 1081 A.D.[1], therefore, about 30 years later than Kṣemendra, he might have utilized the work of the latter. But he surpasses his predecessors in respect of poetical talents so powerfully that probably he knew just to cast them aside scornfully.

The Kathāsaritsāgara[2], "Ocean of Streams of Stories" is probably the current title that can be assumed for the work of Somadeva[3]. In fact it is a sea in which all the rivers of stories have fallen, and the main story of Naravāhanadatta forms merely a frame for the rivers of stories, that having sprung out from all possible sources flow into this one ocean. The Kashmirian primary work had already this character, and it was according to this that Somadeva worked. We know from the author himself that he makes no claim to having invented the stories, but he explains (I, 10-12):

> My this book is just like its primary work. I have not allowed myself to deviate in the least. I have merely

1921, 244 ff. and Grierson, ibid 424 ff; S. P. V. Ranganathaswami Aryavaragun, Ind. Ant 48, 1919, 211 ff. and Grierson, Ind. Ant. 49, 1920, p. 120.

1. Somadeva wrote his book for diverting the mind of Sūryamatī, the grandmother of King Harṣa of Kashmir, see above p. 56, note 1.

2. Books I to V edited with a German translation by H. Brockhaus, Leipzig and Paris 1839; from book VI upto the end (Sanskrit text only) by the same in AKM IIand IV (1862 and 1866). Textual criticism with exegetical notes on the same edition by H. Kern JRAS III, 1, 1867, p. 167 ff. Recent and better edition by Durgāprasād, Bombay, NSP 1889 (2nd ed. 1903). Contents of the first five books reported by H. H. Wilson (1824) in his works III, 156-268. Complete English translation by C H. Tawney in the Bibl. Ind. 2 vols. Calcutta 1880—1884. [The same reprinted with notes etc. by N. M. Penzer in 10 vols. London 1924-28]. Selections from the German translation by J. Hertel, Bunte Geschichten aus dem Himalaya, München 1903. The first volume of the complete German translation (from Sanskrit) by A. Wesselski has been published (Berlin 1914-15). The book X has been translated into German by H. Schacht, Indische Erzählungen, Lausanne and Leipzig 1918. Text criticism and literary researches have been provided by J. S. Speyer, Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara (Verh. der kon. Akademie van Wetensch to Amesterdam, Afd. Lett., N. R. VIII, 5) Amsterdam 1908. Cf. C. H. Tawney JRAS 1908, 907 ff. and Lacôte, Essai, p. 67 ff.

3. Winternitz does not believe that the real title of the work was Bṛhatkathāsaritsāgaraślokasaṁgraha, as suggested by Locôte Essai p. 63 ff. In the introduction the author merely says that in his opinion the title of his work Kathāsaritsāgara means a collection of the essence of the Bṛhatkathā" (Bṛhatkathāsārasaṁgraha). It is not improbable that the dialectical Kashmirian recension had the title or undertitle Kathāsaritsāgara or Bṛhatkathāsaritsāgara (see Lacôte, ibid).

abridged together the big volume of the work, and the language is different. I have skilfully exerted myself to the task of resetting the expressions and to keep true to the context (of the stories) on one hand and to introduce into it an element of ornate poetry on the other without letting the (original) sentiment of the story suffer in the least. I have not made this endeavour for the purpose of satisfying any desire to become famous for my intelligence, but simply to (impress easily) the colourful net of stories upon the mind of the readers[1].

Really the Kathāsaritsāgara is a work of ornate poetry that combines all the excellences of popular poetry in a certain sense, with the excellences of ornate poetry, such as must have been the Kashmirian Bṛhatkathā[2]. The nice, fully ornate, but never artificial language, the moderate use of figures of speech like puns and similes and likewise the choiced use of ornate metres are suitably set in the whole work[3]. Whilst in the novels like Subandhu's Vāsavadattā and Bāṇa's Kādambarī have a gross disparity between the simple narrative theme and the artificial form, Somadeva has realised this, and he has always tried to make the form suitable to the theme and nowhere has he allowed the form to become his main objective. Undisputedly he is one of the most pleasant and first rate Indian poets.

When Somadeva assures us that he has most faithfully followed his model, we should not only believe him, but also attribute even the obvious short-comings found in his work to this situation. One such short-coming is the arrangement of the subject-matter. In the Kashmirian basic work itself

1. The Different interpretations of this stanza have been put together by Lacôte, Essai, p. 123 ff.

2. As in the strict sense of the term the word popular poetry can hardly designate the Bṛhatkathā. The work has never been a collection of popular tales (somewhat like Brother Grimm's Tales for children), but from its very beginning it has had been an independent work of poetry in which stories after stories have been gradually added, many of which may have been in circulation among the people, whilst others may have had their origin in different literary works. In course of time the work had become popular in the same way as the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa.

3. Of the 21388 stanzas of the Kathāsaritsāgara, there are only 761 that are written in ornate metres, the remaining ones are all written in the epical śloka. Cf. Speyer, Studies about the Kathās. p. 174 ff.

we find the main story overrun by the rest of the narrative stuff, and probably this is the reason that very often we find stories in places where they are badly misplaced and that sometimes the stories in different versions occur twice even thrice in different places in this extensive work. Besides the main story of King Naravāhanadatta, selected to become the chief of Vidyādharas, having become far less interesting than most of the intercalated stories, too may be attributed to the primary work itself[1]. It is basically somewhat tiring, when we are told, how the king of the story, who is just a little of the nature of Don Juan, wins one woman after another. Since all these women from the beginning are meant for him, all of them throw themselves with all their force about his neck. And the difficulties that present themselves in the way to union or to reunion signify nothing. However, this is not the case only with the main story, but also with many of the subsidiary stories as well - at least from the European point of view - that much of the charm gets lost when it is found just in the beginning of the story that everything is predestined either through a curse or through some prediction[2].

But there can be no question that Somadeva was not so much concerned over the tale of Naravāhanadatta as over the "colourful net of stories" that were interwoven into this fiction. More interesting than the stories of Naravāhanadatta are the stories, anticipated as introductory narratives, of his father Udayana, his faithful and wise minister Yaugandharāyaṇa and his two wives Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī. Although in many respects the Udayana-stories correspond to Buddhist narratives[3], still the deviations in individual stories are very

1. Both of these shortcomings were probably not to be found in the recension that formed the basis of the work of Buddhasvāmin.

2. Many a time we hear about this predestination first at the end of the story that suits in decidedly better. It is also correct what has been said by Hertel (über das Tantrākhyāyika; ASGW 1904, p. 124) that Somadeva has little consideration for the nature of the tales, and frequently when something appears to him as unbelievable he tries to give it a realistic explanation.

3. Cf. Lacôte, Essai p. 247 ff., besides A. Schiefner, Mahākātyāyana und König Tschaṇḍa-Pradyota (Mémoires de l'Acad. imp. des sciences de St. Petersbourg, t. XXII, No. 7, 1875). Here we find also (p. 35 ff.), as in the Kathāsaritsāgara 12, the story of the Wooden Elephant corresponding to the "Trojan Horse"; see above II, 155, transl. p. 194 and III, p. 220.

great, and as a fiction the version of Somadeva was distinctly different.

The (approximately 350) intercalated stories are partly such as may be considered to form the episodes of the main story and stand in somehow natural relation to it or rather may, more or less, be brought within the context; but in a great measure they are such as have been interlaced into the frame of the main story or do not stand in any internal relationship with it. There is hardly any class of stories whatsoever that we do not see to have found entry into the Kathāsaritsāgara. Fictions and fiction-like tendencies like meetings with heavenly damsels, the interferences by gods and demons in the affairs of man, the gifts of wonderful things of the type of a "magic table", etc., wizards and witches, money-seeker, wealth-digger, transformation of man into animals, magic locks and keys etc. are to be found among the stories that do not properly belong to the category of tales. But in the more colourful admixtures, such as we have already seen also in the jātaka-books, we find by the side of proper tales also novelistic stories, the stories of boatmen by the side of those of shipwreck and wonderful palaces under the bottom of the seas, stories on advantageous travels on the earth, romantic love-stories, in which love is often aroused through dreams and portraits, stories of thieves, stories of scoundrels, fools' stories, witty anecdotes, stories about men who are out and out wise, but also stray mythological narratives, epical expressions and Buddhistic, Jainistic and Brāhmaṇical legends. The whole of the books like the Pañcatantra and the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā have been taken into this "ocean of streams of stories", and likewise there are independent big novels in which other smaller stories have been included, such the Padmāvatīkathā in book XVII and the Vikramādityakathā in Book XVIII. Probably it has also a book of "fools' story" (*mugdhakathā*) and one book of "wife-stories" (*strīkathā*) that have been worked into in our book.

In a very appropriate manner, either our poet or his predecessor has inserted a number of fool's stories

in between the nīti-stories of the Pañcatantra[1] for the purpose of drawing a line of contrast, hardly with the idea of teaching his own political (nīti) wisdom. They might or might not, as has happened in all times and among all the nations, set the muscle of risibility into motion. Somadeva did not pursue any other goal[2]. Many of the fool's jokes narrated here are well-known not only in India but elsewhere too in world-literature. Such are the story of the hungry traveller who eats seven cakes till he becomes satisfied and observes that he would have been equally satisfied had he eaten the seventh-cake the first, or that of the servant, who removes the door from the hinge over which he is to keep watch and goes with it to the theatre, or that of the fool who boasts that his father maintained his celibacy during his life-time, etc.

So as all these stories are told mainly for the purpose of exciting laughter - many of which end with the words "even the stones burst when they heard the story"-so also in the stories of knaves, in which the knaveries of a master-thief, of a gambler or elsewhere of some scoundrel leader are narrated in a witty manner. Very remarkable is the story of the rogue, who bribed the king, and through this he began to have a talk with him everyday. At this the ministers began to treat him as an important and influential person and bribed him in order that he might speak to the king in their favour. In this manner he hoarded a great treasure with which he lastly appeased the king so much so that the latter made him his chief minister (66, 110). One of the nice knave-stories

1. Kathās. 60-63. The fool's stories in the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī are placed after the Pañcatantra-section, all put together, XVI, 568-584. Some fool's stories occur also in the Kathās. 65, 140 ff. J. Hertel (Ein Altindisches Narrenbuch, BSGW 64. Bd. Leipzig 1912) has shown that at least half of the sketchings of fools narrated in the 11th century by Somadeva have been taken from an old Indian fool's story-book, that was written in about 492 A D. and was compiled about the same time by a monk Ārya Saṁghasena, to which go back the fools' stories translated in 492 A.D. into Chinese by his disciple Guṇavṛddhi. (From the Chinese Po Yu King has been made the French translation "Cinq cents contes" by E. Chavannes). That stories of this sort existed at least in the 2nd century A. D. is shown by a relief on the stūpa of Bharhut (see above, II, 108; trans. p.134) belonging to the jātaka No. 46.

2. Against this Hertel, ibid, who considers the fool's book as a nīti-work.

is that of the master rascal Mūladeva and of his cunning wife, who begot him a son, who surpassed his father in cunning and wit[1]. In many of these rogue-stories religion and still more their champions are badly ridiculed. Apparently harmless is the story of the gambler who deceived the god of death. On account of his evil deeds he must live in the hell till the end of creation (*kalpa*). But because he is sure to become Indra for one day as a consequence of his gift of a piece of gold to a pious man, Yama, the god of death, gives him the option of chosing to have one first : either residence in hell for the duration of the *kalpa* or have the status of Indra for one day. He wants to be Indra first. No sooner he becomes Indra, he permits his all male and female friends to enter into the heaven and rejoices their company and with them he is taken to different religious places on the earth by the gods. On account of this his sins get exhausted and he remains permanent Indra (121, 188 ff.). Mischievous is the story of the two rogues, one of whom calls himself Śiva and the other Mādhava (Viṣṇu). One of them plays the part of a Vaiṣṇava ascetic, and his comrade that of a Rajput. With false gold and false diamonds they excite the greed of a greedy *purohita* and carry away his all wealth (24, 82 ff.). Ascetics are not seldom swindlers and robbers. One such ascetic is himself cheated once. With the intention of taking into his possession a beautiful girl he reports to her father about her birth under the influence of an evil star and advises him to discard her. The father packs her in a box and casts her off. A prince finds the beautiful girl and the ascetic gets a monkey that takes out his eyes and tears off his ears.

The number of women's stories is quite large. Among them the stories of faithless and wicked wives prevail[1]. For example, a king has a wonderful

1. 124, 132 ff. translated into German by F. von der Leyen in Preusz. Jahrb. 99, 1900, p. 88ff. Mūladeva appears as a famous wizard in Kap. 89 (Vetālap. 15). Cf. Bloomfield, The Character and Adventures of Mūladeva (Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society Vol. LII, No. 212, 1913) on this wholly unique character in Indian literature. He is a wizard, a master thief, a teacher of the art of theft as well of the art of love, a terrible gambler and on the whole a lively and amiable rogue. See also P. E. Pavolini, GSAI 9, 1895-6, p. 175 ff.

white elephant, who gets hurt and falls down. A divine voice makes the announcement that the elephant will get well when a chaste woman will touch him. Each of nearly 80,000 wives of the king and all the women of the town come and touch the elephant, but he does not stand up. Only one poor woman is found, who is so pious and chaste that the moment she touches the animal he stands up. Now the king marries the sister of this pure lady and shuts her inside a palace in a lonely island, but is lastly deceived by her as well (36, 9 ff). The chapters 58, 64 and 65 contain a whole series of such stories[1]. Amongt this sort of world-wide current stories are found those of the water-spirit, who goes about with his wife within his body and is deceived by her[2] who is not faithful to him[3] etc.

As against the stories of wicked and unfaithful wives there are also a small number of stories of honest and faithful wives. For world literature too, the story of the wise and faithful woman Devasmitā, who assures the young men who intend to seduce her away to meet them at a fixed place just to let them go away with a stigma on their faces[4]. An idyll, that is rightly mentioned as a suitable antethesis to the story of Philemon and Baucis[5], is narrated in 27, 79 ff,

There was once a king, Dharmadatta by name, the ruler of Kośala. He had a wife who respected her husband as a god. One day all of a sudden she came to remember of her former birth and spoke about this to her husband.

1. See also 34, 182 ff.; 60, 3ff.; 61, 193 ff. (at the same time also a fool's story); 66, 29 ff.; 71, 22 ff.; 77, 48 ff.; 124, 140 ff.

2. 63, 6 ff. Cf. 64, 154 ff.; jātaka 436 and Chavannes, Cinq cent contes, I, XIII ff., 377 ff,; Tausend und eine Nacht I, 8 (Weil).

3. 65, 2 ff. Cf. jātaka 193; Benfey, Pantschatantra I, 436 ff.; Gaston Paris, ZVV XIII, 1903; Pavolini, GSAI XI 1897-8; JRAS 1898, 375.

4. Hertel, Bunte Geschichten, p. 73 ff. A partially doublet is the story of Upakośā (4, 28 ff.; Hertel, ibid p. 95 ff.). Winternitz in the "Globus", Bd. 92, 1907, p. 78 f. has shown that a parallel to the story of Devasmitā, who is a replica of Portia, in a South Arabian narrative (in D. H. Müller, Die Mehri - und Soqotri - Sprache III, Vienna 1907, p. 30 ff.; 78 ff.; 162). See also 56, 171 ff.; 61, 300 ff.; 64, 34 ff.

"O king, I am just reminded today of my former birth not far away hence. It will be unpolite on my part if I do not narrate the same to you : in case I tell you this I am sure to die. It is said that in case one is reminded suddenly of his former birth and if he speaks it out he is sure to die. On this account, O my royal husband, I am wholly unnerved." The king retorts that he too has just come to remember of his former birth and asks her to narrate it, whatever be the consequence. At this the queen narrates : "In this very land I was a dutiful maid-servant of a Brāhmaṇa, named Mādhava. The name of my husband was Devadāsa. He was an obedient servant in the house of a trader. There in our own home that we had established we were living on the food that each of us used to bring from our employers. We were three pairs : water-tub and pitcher, broom and bed-stead, I and my husband. We were living happily in the house; there was never a quarrel and we rejoiced and ate the little that was left over after we had made our offerings to gods, manes and guests. In case either or both of us had some spare piece of cloth and if some poor person came, it was given to him. Now there was a famine. Therefore, the quantity of food needed for maintenance became less day by day. When our bodies had become emaciated with hunger and our spirit had already by degrees lost all hopes, one day there came a tired Brāhmaṇa at meal-time. Although we were ourselves dying for food we gave him the last quantity of food that we still had. When he had eaten it and gone away, the spirit of life left my husband, as if out of anger that he had taken care of that beggar and not of it. Then I erected a pyre of wood for my husband, put his body on it and burnt myself with him, and so my ill luck too left me. After this I was reborn in the palace of a king and became your wife. The tree of noble work bears the never-perishing fruit for the pious." When the queen had thus spoken to Dharmadatta, the latter said, "come, dear, I am your husband of the former birth. I was Devadāsa, the servant of the trader. Today I too have come to remember of my that former life". Therefore, after the king has said this and

disclosed his identity, he goes to the heaven, mourns, but immediately rejoices there the company of his wife[1].

The stories of faithless wives mentioned above, at least partly, had originated from Buddhist sources[2]. But Buddhist stories are found even elsewhere in the Kathāsaritsāgara not in a small number, although Benfey's hypothesis[3] that "almost all" tales in Somadeva's work are Buddhistic is certainly not correct. For the purpose of accuracy, it is significant that although Somadeva was not a Buddhist, he has faithfully followed his source and fully maintained the Buddhist character of the stories. For example Buddhistic[4] are, in chapters 27 and 28, the series of karman-stories, besides the stories of the trader's son who is converted for fear of death, of the prince, who becomes a monk and takes out his one eye for the sake of a woman, whose beauty he admires etc. A complete chain of Buddhist stories is narrated in chapter 72 for the purpose of elucidation of the 6 *pāramitās*. Even the Vetālapañcaviṁśati-stories significantly exhibit Buddhist influence[5]. Allusions to Buddhist canons occur elsewhere too[6].

Notwithstanding this the religious atmosphere that permeates the work of Somadeva is quite different. It is

1. Other stories about faithful wives and actual former life are narrated in 56, 171 ff.; 61, 300 ff., 64, 34 ff.; 111, 24 ff.; 112, 111 ff. The story about a Brāhmaṇa and his two wives who were united with a clover-leaf is narrated in 73,417 ff. We learn from 38, 3 ff. and 58, 2 ff. that fidelity is not unknown even among harlots.

2. Such undoubtedly are all the stories narrated in chapter 64, where the heroes, after the experience that there was no faithful woman, became monks. In the stories 65, 2 ff., 45 ff., the hero is expressedly said to be a partial incarnation of Bodhisattva.

3. Pantschatantra I, 148 f.

4. It is not clear why Hertel, Bunte Geschichten, p.1 55ff., translated saugata (common designation for "Buddhist") by "Jaina".

5. Thus the mention of Māra in the Vetāla-stories 10 and 17. In the Vetāla-story 20, the behaviour of the boy is that of a Bodhisattva. Other Buddhistic stories are 33 and 36 ff. ; 41, 9 ff.; 63, 53 ff.; 65, 132 ff. (a cloister anecdote of a foolish monk); 56, 141 ff. (variant of the Mittavindaka-jātaka, see above II, 106, trans. p. 132). Probably Buddhistic is the story of unmādinī (15, 63 ff.) 33, 62 ff., 91, 3 ff. Vetālap. 16), that corresponds to the jātaka No. 527 (see above II, 114, trans; p. 140). In Rājataraṅgiṇī 4, 17, a similar story is narrated about a historical king ; cf. Zachariae, Bezz. Beitr. IV, 1878, 360 ff.

6. So 65, 46; 117, 32; 75; 120, 50; 116.

the glorification of Śiva and his consort (Pārvatī, Gaurī, Durgā, Devī etc.) that prevails throughout. Whenever a miraculous relief from some need or danger is required, there appears in person either Śiva himself or his wife. Bodhisattva Jīmūtavāhana himself goes into the temple of Gaurī to worship the goddess[1]. Unusually frequent is the mention of sacrifices of human-being, that is either brought to Durgā or is (more frequently) offered to her for the purpose of success of some witchcraft or for begetting a child or for fulfilment of some other desire. The wild robber-like Bhillas, who live in forests, as a rule make offerings of human-being to the goddess, and for this purpose they attack people and bring them to the temple[2]. The Liṅga-cult too is pretty frequently mentioned. Women and girls who offer their prayers in temples are particularly frequent[3]. The Mother-cult and the Tantric rites play a rôle in many stories. So in the witch-stories, that are not rare and do not imitate the wild pantomime of European stories of this type. The activities of witches are often described in a very neat manner[4]. Although Śiva is the supreme deity, other gods too appear and all of them are worshipped. So for example Naravāhanadatta himself is taken to Śvetadvīpa, the heavenly abode of Viṣṇu and sings a hymn addressed to this god[5].

Somadeva in all probability found this colourful admixture of these secular and religious stories in the Kashmirian Bṛhatkathā. His work is of beautiful and amiable type, in which he narrates the stories in a fine language, full of witty turnings and poetical descriptions. The praiseworthy simplicity of language that greatly suits the plain stories, necessarily elevates the position of Somadeva higher than

1. Bosch, ibid. p. 143 ff. has shown that the Jīmūtavāhana-legends (22, 16 ff.; 90, 3 ff.) in their original form were not essentially Buddhistic, but in them a Brāhmaṇical pious hero was transformed into a Bodhisattva; (see also above p. 258)

2. In the Rama-tale 51, 59 ff. Lava is caught by Lakṣmaṇa for a human-sacrifice that Rāma will perform.

3. So 37, 3 ff.; 43, 158 ff.; 51, 95 ff. etc.

4. So for example 56, 76 ff.; 121, 72 ff.; 123, 207 ff. etc.

5. In 54, 19 ff., 29 ff. Also 71, 67 ff.; 72, 23 ff. Viṣṇu is honoured.

does the kāvya-style over which he certainly possesses mastery. Many stories, for example in the Vetālapañcaviṁśati-section, are narrated in a very ornate style[1]. And wherever the subject-matter so requires his language very often becomes flexible.

Thus above all, when he speaks about his country Kashmir, as the "head-jewel of the earth (*pṛthvīśiromaṇiḥ*)[2] :

himavaddakṣiṇe deśaḥ kāśmīrākhyosti yaṁ vidhiḥ ।
svargakautūhalaṁ kartuṃ martyānāmiva nirmame ॥

In the south of the Himālaya, there is the country Kashmir, that was made by the creator as if for the purpose of satisfaction of the mortal's curiosity to enjoy the heaven[3] etc.

In respect of employment of similes and puns, Somadeva ranks amongst the best poets. Here is given only one example (87, 29 ff.) :

bhrāmyataśca jagāmāsya bhīmo grīṣmorukesarī ।
pracaṇḍādityavadano dīptatadraśmikesaraḥ ॥
priyāvirahasantaptapānthaniśvāsamārutaiḥ ।
nyastoṣmāṇa ivātyuṣṇā vānti sma ca samīraṇāḥ ॥
śuṣyadvidīrṇapaṅkāśca hṛdayaiḥ sphuṭitairiva ।
jalāśayā dadṛśire gharmaluptāmbusaṁpadaḥ ॥
cīrīcītkāramukharāstāpamlānadalādharāḥ ।
madhuśrīvirahānmārgeṣvarudanniva pādapāḥ ॥

Harisvāmin, a Brāhmaṇa, who has lost his wife, goes about in all the places where one can reach while searching for her. "And while he was thus going from one holy place to another there came the summer, the horrible lion, whose jaws were the terrible sun and whose manes were the burning rays. Scorching hot winds were blowing as if in them the warmth of groaning of the wanderers, separated from their beloved, had got accumulated on account of weeping. The tanks with their water dried up and their drying clay rent asunder were lying there as if with broken heart. The trees standing along the paths appeared with their barks sobbing on account of separation from the friendly

1. The story 55, 26 ff. is written wholly in the kāvya-style, so also the (*praśasti*), the concluding stanza (missing in Ed. Brockhaus).

2. 63, 53 ff; 65, 214. 73, 79 ff.

spring, whilst their leaves, like their lips, were withering on account of heat (pain)".

The Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva has the greatest importance for the history of Indian literature also on account of the fact that in it there are several stories which have been worked upon by several other poets[1], of course, not only on the basis of Somadeva's work, but also on that of Guṇāḍhya or on that of some older recension of the Bṛhatkathā, not available to us elsewhere so nicely as in Somadeva. The work is of the highest importance for the history of the World Literature too, inasmuch as not a few stories that we find in Somadeva, nay that are still older and perhaps have had their source in the Bṛhatkathā, are the most popular and most familiar ones of the West. The question, as to whether the relevant stories are of Indian origin, does not permit of a definite answer in all cases. Often there are only a few passages that the Indian stories have in common with literatures of other countries, thus for example the story of the smiling fish[2] or that of the princess and the thief[3] etc. Other stories, with minor deviations are current among other nations, such is the story of Hariśarman, the Indian "omniscient doctor"[4]. In many cases it may be doubtful to say whether we have before us passages taken from the fables that originated in different countries independently of one another, or if these passages have been borrowed. To this class belong the tales of

1. To this category belong the thrilling stories 140,17 ff., of which the fable is the basis of Bhavabhūti's Mālatīmādhava, and the story of King Sumanas and the learned parrot (59, 22 ff.), on which is based Bāṇa's "Kādambarī;" cf. Mańkowski, WZKM 15, 1901, 213 ff; 16, 1902, 147 ff.

2. 5, 14 ff. Cf. F. Liebrecht in the Orient und Occident I, 341 ff; Pentamerone 36; Straparola IV, 1.

3. 64, 43 ff. already compared by H. H. Wilson with the tale of Rhampsinit narrated by Herodotus. From the Indian version the story was translated into Chinese as early as 516 A.D.; see E. Huber in BEFEO 4, 1904, 698 ff. A variant in the Tibetan Kanjūr too. Cf. Forke, Die Indischen Märchen, p. 66 ff. J. C. Fraser, Pausanias, Vol. V, p. 176 ff. (on Paus. IX, 37, 3) has given a review of the story of the treasure of Rhampspinit and its parallels in the world-literature; see also R. Köhler, Kleinere Schriften I, 198 ff.; Chavannes Cinq cents contes 3, 146 ff.; Gaston Paris in RHR t. 55, 1907, 151 ff., 267 ff.

4. 30, 92 ff. Cf Grimm, Kinder- und Hausmärchen, No. 98; Benfey, Orient und Occident I, 374 ff; Th. Zachariae, ZVV 15, 1905, 373 ff.

witchcraft, like that of the poet, corresponding to the "magic-table" that fills by itself, the magic stick and the wonderful shoe "seven miles deep"[1], or the often repeated motif of men who are swallowed by a big fish and again come out alive[2] or the motif of the wife of Potiphar[3], etc[4].

Lastly we must not forget to mention the extent to which our knowledge of Indian culture is based on the Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva. We have already seen that we learn from this work much about Indian religions and know about the position of women in ancient India. But we get from Somadeva's work abundant amount of information also about the caste-system, about ethnographical conditions, about art, artists and artisans, about court-life, about gambling, about drinking booths and other things about the actual life of the Indian people.

The Kashmirian edition of the Bṛhatkathā contains the whole of the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā, "the Twenty-five (stories) of Vetāla", an Indian story-book that like the Pañcatantra has got wide currency in world-literature. This work too had to share the fate of other Indian works that became popular and its old text is entirely lost to us and it has come down to us in different recensions made in later ages. The versifications of Kṣemendra and Somadeva are

1. 3, 47 ff. Cf. J. J. Meyer, Daśakumāracarita-Übersetzung, Einleitung, p. 67 ff; Forke, Die indischen Märchen, p. 55 ff.; Hertel, Jinakīrtis "Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla, p. 60, 67, 76, 110.

2. 25, 47 ff., 74, 192 ff., 123, 105 ff.; cf. Rājataraṅgiṇī IV, 504; Weber in AKM I, 4, p. 32 (Śatruñjayamāhātmya X); Hertel; ZDMG 65, 440. In the story of Jona H. Gunkel (Kultur der Gegenwart I, VII, p. 56) has assumed a Phonecian tale of a boatmen.

3. 49, 4 ff., like 33, 36 ff. Also in the book Sindbad. Cf. Tawney, I, 464 n, Hertel, Jinakīrtis "Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla", p. 14 f., 48 f.; Temple, Legends of the Panjāb, I, XIV, 11-13; II, XV, 396 ff. On a similar story in Firdusi's Shāhnāmeh, see Javanji Jamshedji Modi, JBRAS 18, 206 ff.; on the Greek story see U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendroff, Griechishe Tragödien I, 108f.; on the Biblical story see H. Gunkel, Internat. Monatsschrift 12, 1918, p. 442 f.

4. Tawney has collected together a large number of parallels to the stories and motifs in the Kathās. in the notes to his translation and a few also in the Journal of Philology 12, 1883, 122 ff, See also above p. 359. notes, and p. 364 notes.

in respect of chronology older[1] than the two different recensions by Śivadāsa[2] and Jambhaladatta[3]. But it is Śivadāsa who has passed on to us the story in its original form—an admixture of prose and verse[4].

"The Twenty-five Stories of Vetāla" derive their title from the frame in which they are set :

> A yogin brings to King Vikramasena[5] a fruit everyday about which he says that it contains a diamond. He pursues this course just to move the king agree to assist him in a corpse-witchcraft, by which he is sure to obtain the help of a vetāla[6] for success in his witchcraft.

1. Bṛhatkathāmañjarī IX, 2, 19-1221, Kathāsaritsāgara 75-99. Approximately about half of the vetāla-stories from the Kathās. have been translated into German by F. von der Leyen (Indische Märchen, Halle a. S. 1898) who has, in the appendix, traced the course of these stories in world-literature. On the vetāla-stories, see also S. Lévi in JA 1886, s. 8, t. VII, 190 ff. Kṣemendra deviates little from Somadeva, but he had used also some recensions of the Bṛhatkathā, other than the Kashmirian (see Speyer, Studies about the Kathās. 37 f.). On Somadeva's version see Brockhaus in BSGW 1853, p. 181 ff.

2. Die Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā in den Recensionen des Śivadāsa und eines Ungenannten mit kritischen Kommentar, edited by H. Uhle (AKM VIII, 1), Leipzig 1884. The prose text of the recension of the anonymous author is an abridged rendering of the verses of Kṣemendra. In many manuscripts of Śivadāsa too verses from Kṣemendra have been inserted. H. Uhle has edited the text with a critical apparatus along with a table of contents in BSGW, Bd. 66, Leipzig 1914 on the basis of a manuscript. Cf. Hertel, DLZ 1918, 257 ff. Śivadāsa's Recension has been translated into Italian by V. Bettei in GSAI, 7, 1893, pp. 83-157 ; 8, 1894, p. 187 ff. and SIFI I, 1897, The first five stories have been translated into German by A. Luber, Görz 1875.

3. Published in Calcutta in 1873. This recension does not have metrical epigrams, and in respect of contents it stands closer to the Kashmirian recension. The language (according to Aufrecht, Bodl. Cat. I, 152 f.) is more elegent than that of Śivadāsa. On an abridged version of the Vetālap. by Vallabhadāsa see Eggeling, Ind. off. Cat. VII, p. 1564 f. Even in case Jambhaladatta himself was a younger author, his recension too goes back to a very old source and he knew the stories in their original form - a thing that has been shown as probable by Bosch, ibid, 62 ff.

4. Bosch, ibid p. 22 ff., tries to prove that the recension of Śivadāsa, as also that of the "anonymous author", goes back to a metrical version. But this statement, as also the hypotheses of Charpentier, Paccakabuddhageschichten, p. 142 ff. hangs in the air so long as we do not know whether or not Buddhasvāmin's Ślokasaṁgraha and Guṇāḍhya's Bṛhatkāthā do not contain also the Vetālapañcaviṃśati-stories.

5. In Somadeva, he is called Trivikramasena. First of all the new Indian translations have carried the story to the famous king Vikramāditya. The yogin is mentioned as a Digambara in Śivadāsa, as against a Bhikṣu in Somadeva and a Śramaṇa in Kṣemendra.

6. The vetālas are the ghosts, who carry their evil designs in corpse-burning places and make in the corpses their abode. Like all other

The king agrees. One dark night he starts for the place of burning corpse, where the yogin is waiting for him. The latter asks him to go to a distant lonely place, where a corpse is hanging from a tree. He will have to take it down and carry it back. The king goes to the tree, brings down the corpse and carries it forth back. In the corpse there is a vetāla, and he proposes to tell the king a story in order to while away his time along the path. At the end of the story, the vetāla asks the king a question, that he must answer. Hardly the king has replied and the corpse disappears and hangs itself on the tree again. The king returns, cuts off the corpse and begins to carry it back again ; but the vetāla again begins to tell a story, asks a question, and this he does twenty-four times. When the vetāla has narrated the twenty-fourth story and put the question, the king is not able to answer, at which he wavers. But the vetāla, is very much pleased at the king on account of his courage and tells him that the yogin bears an evil design towards him and puts into his hand a trick with which he will be able to overpower the wicked wizard and he will himself possess the power of witchcraft.

This frame, in which the stories are set, already shows that the "Twenty-five Stories" originated on the soil of Tantrism, so much so that they can be associated with religion. Most of the narratives, however, are tales, novels, comic and tragic stories, in which witchcraft plays a powerful rôle, and there is no theme construed from any religious point of view. The seed of the work lies neither in Buddhism nor in Jainism[1].

spirits they are capable of assuming all possible forms. They are mischievous; but he who has the courage can through corpse-witchcraft make vetālas even serve him. In the Mahābhārata the vetālas do not appear before the Harivaṁśa. One of the mothers of Skanda is called "vetālamātā" (see E. W. Hopkins, Epic Mythology, p. 46 note, 220 note). Benfey (Kleinere Schriften II, 13 A) has tried to assign the vetāla-cult to Buddhism, but it certainly belongs to the Śaiva-Tantrism, whence in any case it might have been taken over to Tantric Buddhism. A description of the vetāla-magic is given in the Tantrasāra (see Aufrecht, Bodl. Cat. p. 94 f.).

1. The fourth and the sixth stories belong to the religion of the Durgā-cult. In the 14th story Śiva brings about the miracle in Somadeva and Devī in Śivadāsa. The story No. 19 of the son of the thief, who is born of a Brāhmaṇa and is adopted by a king and outspreads his three hands

Even the epigrams, that occupy in the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā as much space as in the Pañcatantra, are relatively just in a few cases Buddhistic or Jainistic, and most of them belong to common ascetic poetry. The rest of the epigrams partly contain rules of life and partly belong to the didactic stuff of dharmaśāstra, of nītiśāstra and also of kāmaśāstra[1]. In addition to the epigrams, we find in Śivadāsa's recension also a number of narrative and descriptive verses that give to the work the character rather of a campū.

The stories of the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā have equal importance for the history of Indian narrative literature and for the history of world-literature. Some of the stories have found their way into different other narrative books of India and also in literatures of other countries of the East and the West.

> Well-known in world literature is the story of Madanasenā, who is betrothed and has promised her ardent lover that she will meet him on the night of her marriage, before she is given over to her husband. She keeps her promise with the consent of her husband. On her nocturnal journey to meet her lover she is overtaken by a thief to whom she narrates her story and

---

for receiving from him his offerings to the manes, can be understood only from the standpoint of Brāhmaṇical death-cult. The stories Nos. 16, 17 and 20 might have been Buddhistic. In Śivadāsa, the story No. 11 has as its introduction an apparently Jaina missionary story, but that is not at all associated with the story itself. The vetāla-stories, have found entry into the Jaina literature too; see Charpentier, Paccekabuddhageschichten, p. 135ff.

1. Most of these verses are probably to be taken as quotations and not as composed by Śivadāsa himself. Many of the verses are found also in other books of stories and in anthologies of epigrams. 23 verses are in Prākrit. Hertel (BSGW 1902, p. 123) has given an index of the epigrams that the Vetālap. has in common with the Jaina version of the Pañcatantra. But that is not certain. The epigrams here, so also there, might have had the same source as the mass of epigrams of unknown authorship and age that have been current as unowned commodity among learned men and authors and partly also among the common people. Since the manuscripts differ from one another in respect of language, and even the occurrence of a stanza in Rudraṭa is no sure proof of Śivādāsa being younger than him (see Pischel, Rudraṭas Śṛṅgāratilaka, p. 26). On other grounds it is apparent that in all events Śivadāsa did not write it before the 12th century (cf. Weber, Indische Streifen III, 514 ff.). On some stanzas in the kāvya-style see Aufrecht, ZDMG 36, 1882, 375 ff. Hertel wrote to Winternitz: "The dependence on the Jaina Pañcatantra is certain, because the question is not of an individual stanza, but of a group of borrowed verses, that were for the first time collected in the Pañcatantra itself".

he leaves her to go free. She comes to the lover and when the latter hears about the consent of the husband, he returns home unnoticed. Now the question is which of the three persons is the nicest[1] ?

To the world-literature belongs also the fifth story of the girl with three suitors. The daughter of the minister Harisvāmin takes the vow that she will marry that man only who will surpass others either in heroism or in knowledge or in witchcraft. The father goes on a journey and offers her to the Brāhmaṇa, who is a great wizard and overpowers through his craft an air-vessel. In the meantime the elder brother of the girl promises her to a highly learned Brāhmaṇa, and the mother to an excellent shooter, without any one of them having knowledge of the promise made by the other two. The marriage is fixed on one and the same day. That very day a demon robs away the girl. The scholar finds out the place where the girl is staying, the magician takes the air-vessel close by and the shooter chases the demon, kills him and brings back the girl. Now the vetāla puts the question as to who of the three should have the girl as his wife, to which the king replies that she should be married to the shooter, since the other two have been merely his assistants in getting her[2].

We may make here a mention of the sixth story too. A dyer's eye catches sight of the daughter of the royal dyer; he is enamoured of her so much so that he promises to the goddess Bhaṭṭārikā to offer her his head in case the beautiful girl will become his wife. He gets the girl as his wife. One day he starts with his young wife and

1. The story (translated also by J. J. Meyer, Daśakumāracarita-Übersetzung. Einleitung p. 73 ff.) is found also in the Turkish Tutinameh, in the "Forty Viziers" (in Thousand and one Nights), in Dschami, in Gaelic tales and Boccaccio's Dekamerone. Cf. Oesterley, Baitāl Pachīsī, p. 198 f. and F. von der Leyen, Indishe Märchen, p. 153 ff. Chinese in Chavannes, No. 117. A jainistic version in Leumann, ZDMG 46, 606.

2. Taken into world-literature by Benfey, Kleinere Schriften II, 96 ff. Shown among the Gypsies and Romanies in Siebenbürgen by Wlislocki, ZDMG 41, 448 ff.

friend for his father-in-law's house. They arrive at the temple of the goddess. The dyer asks his young wife and friend to wait outside, enters into the temple and cuts his head off to appease the goddess. The friend goes to search for him, finds him dead and fears that he will be held guilty for the murder and cuts his own head. The wife goes there, and finding the two persons dead, she is about to commit suicide. But the goddess is pleased; she prevents her from committing suicide and offers to grant her a boon that she will ask for. She asks for getting both of them come to life again. The goddess asks her to put together the heads and the bodies. In haste the young wife changes the heads of the two. Now vetāla asks the question as to who will be her husband. The king replies, he who has the head of her husband, since

"Of all remedies food is the best,
Of all drinks, water is the best,
Of all friends of man, wife is the best,
Of all members of the body, head is the best"[1].

The "Twenty-five stories of Vetāla" has been very often translated into popular Indian languages[2] and is found also in a strongly changed form in the Mongolian Ssiddi-Kür[3].

---

1. The motif of error about heads is found also in a South Indian legend, that has been taken over into Sonnerat's "Reise nach Ostindien und China". This is the source of Gothe's Paria legend ; see Th. Zachariae, Kleine Schriften (1920) 118 ff.

2. During the period of reign of Muhammad Shāh III (1720-1747) the work was rendered into Braja-Bhākhā, whence it was retranslated into Hindī in 1805. The Hindi translation, that differs little from Śivadāsa's version, is best known through European translations. Winternits knew : the Baitāl Pachchīsī, or the twentyfive tales of a Sprite, translated from the Hindi by John Platts, London 1871. The German rendering made according to the English translation of Barker by H. Oesterly, Baitāla Pachīsī oder die fünfundzwanzig Erzählungen eines Dämons, Leipzig 1873.

3. Ssiddi-Kür is formed with Sanskrit siddhi combined with Mongolian kür and means "the dead endowed with supernatural powers". See die, Märchen des Siddhi-kür, kalmukischer Text mit deutscher Übersetzung, edited by B. Jülg, Leipzig 1866. Wholly wrong is Benfey's statement (Pantschatantra I, 410 ff. and Kleinere Schriften II, 10 ff.) based on a superficial knowledge of the work. He knew in addition to the English translations of the Braj-Bhākhā recension and the Tamil version only the Mongolian tales of Ssiddi-kür according to Benjamin Bergmann's "Nomadische Streiferereien im Lande der Kalmüken I, 247 ff.). He expressed the opinion that the Mongolian version contained

A younger work, but likewise containing similarly enlarged and popular stories of a similar character, is the S i ṁ h ā s a n a d v ā t r i ṁ ś a t i k ā (or Siṁhāsanadvātriṁśatikathā, "the Thirty-two Throne Stories"), also called Vikramacarita, "Life and Deeds of Vikrama"[1]. The popularity of this work is proved by the large number of its manuscripts that differ from one another greatly and represent the text in different recensions. There are recensions that are in prose or in prose and verses mixed up together or in verses only. Apparently the South Indian recension stands closest to the original text. Beside it there is one versified South Indian recension that on one hand appears to be in some places very much abridged and on the other very much enlarged in others. There exists a third North Indian recension, in which only the skeleton of some stories is preserved, whilst the moral is greatly enlarged. In the Jaina recension that is very much enlarged and best preserved and is full of moral lessons, the stories are strongly influenced by Jainistic tendencies, and the proper stories have not only been abridged, but here very often they appear in a very much worsened form. The special characteristic of this recension consists in the fact that either in the beginning or at the end of each story there occurs a verse that summarizes the essential points of the story[2]. This recension was probably compiled by Muni K ṣ e m a ṁ k a r a , who appears to have done this on the basis of the text contained in the Māhārāṣṭrī-dialect. The Bengali-recension[3], attributed to V a r a r u c i is just a Brāhmaṇical adaptation of the Jaina version.

---

the original form of the work. Ssiddi-kür, however, has only 13 stories, which have little correspondences with the Indian stories excepting the frame-story. Cf. F o r k e, Die indischen Märchen, p. 17 ff. and E. C o s q u i n, Les Mongols, Niort 1913. On a Tibetan form of the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā see A. H. F r a n c k e, ZDMG 75, 72 ff.

1. Cf. A. W e b e r, Ind. Stud. XV, 185-453; F. E d g e r t o n, American Journal of Philology, 33, 1912, 249-284. The manuscripts have also the titles Siṁhāsanadvātriṁśatputtalikāvarttā or -putrikāvārtā, "Story of the 32 Statues of the Throne"; see A u f r e c h t, Bodl. Cat. 152; E g g e l i n g, Ind. Off. Cat. VII, p. 1566f.

2. Perhaps they are imitated Kathāsaṁgraha-stanzas of the Pañcatantra. But unlike the latter, they do not form the connecting link between the frame-story and intercalated stories. Besides they do not contain the moral of the story as in the Pañcatantra.

3. W e b e r, Ind. Stud. 15, 188 ff.; E g g e l i n g, Ind. Off. Cat. VII, p. 1566 f.; E d g e r t o n, ibid 252, 270. A recension of the work is attributed also to Kālidāsa; see W e b e r, ibid 196, 233, 294

The apparently voluminous introduction begins (according to the fashion of the purāṇas) with the request of Pārvati to her husband Śiva to tell her some interesting story; the god grants her request and narrates the story of the "Deeds of Vikrama"[1]. In the city of Ujjayinī—so he begins—there lived a king Bhartṛhari. Once a Brāhmaṇa brought to him a wonderful fruit that lent eternal youth and immortality. The king loved his wife so sincerely that he did not like to survive her and passed on the fruit to her. The queen gave this to her lover, the stable-superintendent, who sent it as a gift to a harlot. From her it reached the hands of the king. So the king had in this way come to know of the wickedness of his wife, he renounced the world and left his kingdom to his brother Vikramāditya[2]. This mighty king distinguished himself through his heroism and generosity. (The different recensions differ from one another although they narrate episodes about Vikramāditya in greater or smaller details). Once the king paid a visit to the heaven of Indra, and the god presented to him as gift a wonderful throne fitted with 32 female satues, that he carried to his capital. When king Vikramāditya is killed in the fight against Śālivāhana, the throne is dug into earth under the command of the god, since there is none to be found who may be worthy to sit upon it. Many many years later it is found by King Bhoja of Dhārā in a field near his capital, that was established at the site of Ujjayinī and the throne that is dug there is carried to the city and is installed in a majestic hall decorated with a thousand pillars. But when he is to sit on the throne one of the statues utters forth in human voice:—King Bhoja

1. This introduction is lacking in the Jaina version. It begins with the story of King Bhoja, in which the stories of Bhartṛhari and Vikramāditya an inserted.

2. The story of the wonderful fruit is found also in many of the versions of the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā and has been carried into different western literatures and also in "Tausend und eine Nacht"; see Oestrley, Baitāl Pachīsī, p. 13 ff. and Weber ibid, p. 212 ff. The stanzas that partly occur in Vairāgyaśataka of the poet Bhartṛhari have been put here into the mouth of Bhartṛhari. See also above p. 139 on Bhartṛhari.

If you are, in not ideas, heroism, generosity and other noble qualities, like Vikramāditya, you will not be able to sit on this throne. At the request of the king the statue narrates a story that will describe the nobility of thought of Vikramāditya and concludes it by saying :

etat sahajamaudāryaṁ śrīvikramanṛpasya tavāgre kathitam ।
evaṁvidham audāryaṁ yadi tvayi syāt tadāsmin siṁhāsane tiṣṭha ॥

"I have described this natural magnimity of heart of King Vikrama. In case you have in you such a nobility of heart you may sit on this throne". The king then tries to sit on the throne, but he is addressed by the second statue in the same way as by the first, and this second statue tells another story, and so on. At the end we came to know that the statues are wives of gods that are transformed into stone-statues on account of a curse. By meeting King Bhoja they are freed from the effect of the curse and return back to the heaven.

The 32 stories in themselves are indeed very fantastical, and by far are not so lively as those of the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā. And in fact they are outright partly childish, and very often they possibly are the contribution of the Jaina redactor. Originally, this was in no way a manual of morals and in the least a manual of Jaina morals. The original character of the stories significantly appears to have become different under the Jaina guise or distortion[2]. The stories, that are meant to describe the nobility of the heart of the king are now outright altered, so much so that they make him appear as

1. Edgerton, ibid, tries to show that like the Pañcatantra this work too was intended to be a nītiśāstra (so it is indicated in one of the manuscripts), although, not in the sense of a "manual of politics, but rather of a "manual of (ethical) conduct of life". Winternitz believes that this idea was far away from that of the original writer. In all cases the stories were meant to represent Vikramāditya as a model king, inasmuch as the work is as instructive as the Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa. But the character of the work is essentially different from that of the Pañcatantra. First of all those who prepared the later recensions tried particularly by inserting epigrams to make it appear to like the Pañcatantra. See Hertel, in BSGW 1902 p. 127 f.

2. This expression is modified when for example we take into consideration the inappropriate manner in which the legends of the Jaina Saint Siddhasena are mentioned in connection with the stories of Vikramāditya, the crude manner in which the Jaina religion is glorified here (see Weber ibid 282 ff., 285 ff.,) and the manner in which the saintly redactor has removed some of the stories (for example III, V, VI) wholly from his own point of view.

a Jaina saint, who cannot refuse a request of any beggar and is always ready to sacrifice himself for others. In a directly stereotyped manner, however, first of all it is narrated how the king shows his c o u r a g e , through his courage he obtains a boon from some divine being and he presents this with great courage to the first beggar. This conclusion, the giving away of the boon, creates the impression of an interpolation, since stories are so planned as to show Vikramāditya as a fearless hero, who is always ready to leave his life to chance. The episode is frequently repeated that Vikramāditya, for fulfilment of his some desire and for worshipping a goddess for it, tries to cut off his own head, but is prevented by the goddess from doing this, and his desire is fulfilled. This head-cutting for worshipping a goddess, however, is never Jainistic and belongs to Tantra and to the cult in which Durgā is offered a human being[1]. That the original plan of these stories was to depict h e r o i s m and not the generosity as the best quality is proved best by the story No. XXXII which probably is the wittiest of all. It is reproduced here in a few words:—

> In the city of Avantī, when Vikramāditya was ruling, the citizens were very good people. Whatever they ever brought for sale to the market, was purchased by the king, in case anything remained unsold till the evening, so that nobody could complain against the metropolis that no buyer was to be found for anything that was brought for sale. Then a rogue got built an iron-statue of P o v e r t y, brought it to Avantī and asked as its price one thousand dināras. Naturally nobody wanted to purchase it. So in the evening the people of the king purchased it for the high price and put it into the treasury-hall. Now when Lakṣmī, "Fortune", saw Poverty there, she went to the king and complained: "King, I will go away; since in your treasury-hall, Poverty has come." The king requests her to stay, but she says : "Where there is Poverty, I can in no case stay". But the king is unable to recede back from the promise that he has once made and permits Lakṣmī

1. Similarly in the Kathāsaritsāgara, see above p. 362. In case A u f r e c h t (Bodl. Cat. p. 152) speaks of a "recension tantrica", that is wholly unauthorised (notwithstanding W e b e r 207 f.).

to go away. Soon Discrimination (V i v e k a) comes in and says : "O king, we cannot stay in the place where there is Poverty. Fortune has gone away and I too must depart." The king allows him too to go away. After a short while C o u r a g e (Sattva) appears and says: "Lord, we cannot stay at the place where there is Poverty. Fortune and Discrimination have already left before me. I have come here just to bid you farewell, since I have enjoyed your long association. I will go". At this the king shudders and thinks: "Ah, when Courage has left man, what remains then"[1].

prayātu lakṣmīś capalasvabhāvā
guṇāḥ vivekapramukhāḥ prayāntu ।
prāṇāśca gacchantu kṛtaprayāṇā
mā yātu sattvaṁ tu nṛṇāṁ kadācit ॥

"Let L a k ṣ m ī, that is fickle by nature, go;
Let the virtues, with D i s c r i m i n a t i o n as chief, leave:
Even L i f e itself may forsake him,
But C o u r a g e, may it never desert man".

Then he says : "O C o u r a g e, let all others go away. You at least do not go !" Then Courage says : "Sir, where there is P o v e r t y, I can in no case stay". But the king says : "So now she deprives me of my Head ! Without you what will be life to me ?" Now he wants to cut his head off. Courage prevents him from doing this. At this Courage remains with him and his Fortune and Discrimination that have left him come back again.

Since in all the recensions the frame-story makes reference to King Bhoja and Dhārā, the work could not be of an age earlier than the 11th century A. D. Probably it was written in honour of Bhoja, during the period his reign[1]. In about 1574 A. D. this work was translated into Persian under an order of Akbar the Great.[2] It has been

1. Cf. W e b e r ibid 202; E d g e r t o n, ibid 251. Since there is a reference to the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā in the introduction it must be of a later age. No definite conclusion with regard to its antiquity can be drawn from quotations found in it (from the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, the Mahānāṭaka, the Prabodhacandrodaya and Himādri's Dānakāṇḍa), since it is not known whether these citations were in the original work or if they had been included in some of its later recensions.

2. This translation had been rendered into French by Baron

rendered into many new Indian and Siamese languages[1] and has been taken also into Mongolian literature under the title "Story of Ardshi Bordshi Chan"[2].

King Vikramāditya is the hero of many other narrative works too. One such work is, the Mādhavānala-Kāmakandalā-kathā[3] of Ānanda, a disciple of Bhaṭṭa Vidyādhara. It belongs to the most popular stories of India and is still current in popular literature. It is an interesting story of love of a Brāhmaṇa Mādhavānala with a dancing girl Kāmakandalā, who, after a long period of separation, are at last united through the efforts of King Vikramāditya. The story is narrated in simple and unartificial prose, in which numerous Sanskrit and Prākrit stanzas are inserted[4], many of which occur also in the Vetālapañcaviṁśatikā. The concluding stanza shows that Vikramāditya is honoured here :

"There is no king who takes pleasure in doing good (to others), gives charity and is so fearless as Vikramāditya; nor has there been any".

Vikramodaya, a collection of stories written in verses, with King Vikramāditya as the hero, is preserved in a single manuscript. It has been translated into popular Indian and English languages. In this book Vikramāditya appears in the form of parrot as a wise talker. In the fifteenth story is found the 'Salomonic decision' by the side of other narratives on

---

D. Lescallier (New York 1817); see S. d'Oldenburg, JRAS 1888 p. 147; and Th. Zachariae, Kleine Schriften, 1920, p. 162 f.

1. The Bengali version of the work has been prepared by Mṛtyuñjaya and the same has been translated into French by L. Feer, Contes indiens, les trente-deux recits du trône (Batris Sinhasan) ou les merveilleux exploits de Vikramāditya traduits du Bengal, Paris 1883. It is found in Siamese under the title Sib-songlieng; see Bastian in "Orient und Occident III, 171, ff.

2. Ardshi Bordshi is Rājā Bhoja. Cf. A. Schiefner in the Bulletin hist.-phill. de l'Academie de St. Pétersbourg XV, 1858, p. 63 ff.; Benfey, Pantshatantra I, 22 f. and Kleinere Schriften II, 84 ff. and B. Jülg, Die neun Nachtragserzählungen des Siddhi-kür und die Geschichte des Ardschī Bordschi Chan, aus dem Mongolischen übersetzt, Innsbruck 1868.

3. The Mādhavānala-Kathā, published from three London and three Florentive MSS with a Translation of the Prākrit Passages by P.E. Pavolini in OC IX, London I, 430-453. Edited and translated by Pia Guerriniha, Pisa 1908 (that was not made available to W.; see Pavolini, GSAI 22' 313 ff.). There are several manuscripts and two recensions, a smaller one and a bigger one.

4. Cf. H. Schöhl, Die Strophen der Mādhavānalakathā (Diss Müunster), Halle a. S. 1914.

wise sayings[1]. Pañcadaṇḍachattra-prabandha, "The Story of the (Vikramāditya's) Umbrellas, having five Sticks", is a later work prepared by a Jaina compiler who did not live before the 15th century[2]. It is a book containing stories of magic and witchcraft, full of wonderful adventures, in which Vikramāditya plays the rôle of a powerful magician. With one stanza in the beginning and one stanza at the end the compiler has inserted Jaina moral that passes before our vision like Faust. The language is not pure Sanskrit, but Sanskrit mixed up with the popular Mārwārī-dialect spoken in Mārwār.

A work, that in form is indeed an epic, but in respect of its contents stands close to the book described here, is the Vīracaritra[3] of Ananta. It describes in 30 adhyāyas the struggle of Śālivāhana against Vikramāditya as a kind of introduction, in which the adventures of Śūdraka, an associate sovereign of Śalivāhana and later of his son Śaktikumāra are spoken about mainly. Later, however, he enters into conflict with him and unites with the successors of Vikramāditya and other heroes and defeats his enemy. Notwithstanding these apparently historical names, the epic is full of mythological legendry passages and numerous stories have been inserted into the main story. A similar work is Śālivāhanakathā, a poetical biography of Śālivāhana, by Śivadāsa. Although it is an epic (in 18 cantos), it is partly written in prose[4].

To the most famous and popular narrative work of India belongs the Śukasaptati, "The Seventy-two Stories of a Parrot". This book is not better than other works of narrative literature and has received a great many interpolations. Of this work we have before us many manuscripts of many recensions that differ widely from one another, trans-

1. Cf. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. VII, p. 1501 ff. and Th. Zachariae in ZVV 1906, 135 ff.; Kleine Schriften 152 ff., 166 ff. A cycle of stories, in which Vikramāditya appears in the from of a parrot, is found also in the Jainistic Pārśvanāthacaritra and has been translated by M. Bloomfield, An art of Entering Another's Body: A Hindu Fiction Motif, in Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 56, 1917, p. 21 ff.

2. Edited and translated by A. Weber, ABA 1877.

3. H. Jacobi, Über das Vīracaritram, Ind. Stud. 14, 97-160 mit einer Textprobe.

4. Cf. Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. VII, p. 1567 ff.

lations in popular Indian languages and redactions in several foreign languages: but the original must be taken to be irrecoverably lost. The Sanskrit text that we possess is of a very late age, and we are in a position to prove that the original work must have been older by many centuries. Through the edition and translation of Richard Schmidt[1] the two recensions have come to be known to us, one of which contains a textus simplicior and the other a textus ornatior. Both of these texts are in no case related as earlier and later revisions; but the textus simplicior is just an extract from a more complete text, that is lost to us. This lost text must have been closer to the textus ornatior. Although the latter, in course of time, has removed far from the primary work and contains numerous decorations and interpolations, still in it, the stories are throughout narrated in a better manner than in the textus simplicior, that in many cases has become obscure on account of brevity and tastes as partly devoid of humour. Such is likewise the frame-story, where the textus ornatior, in spite of all alterations and additions, has in essence remained faithful to the original version. Below is given in short the frame-story :—

> The merchant Haradatta has a son Madanasena, who has wholly yielded to sensuousness and always indulges in pleasures of love, to which he with wife Prabhāvatī surrenders, and both of them completely neglect the other aims of life concerning both the worldly affairs and their religious obligations. Haradatta is very much perturbed on account of the activities of his son. Then Brāhmaṇa Trivikrama, his friend, comes to his help. The latter procures a wise parrot and a wise crow (the two are really a Gandharva-pair, who are changed into birds on account of wrath of Śiva for some omission), which the father keeps in a cage and puts inside the chamber of Madanasena. Now the parrot gives him wise advice, by telling all sorts of stories full of instruc-

1. Vier Erzählungen aus der Śukasaptati, Sanskrit und Deutsch, Kiel 1890; Anmerkungen zum textus simplicior der Śukasaptati, ZDMG 48, 1894, 580ff. Textus simplicior, edited in AKM X, 1, Leipzig 1897 and translated into German, Kiel, 1894, Textus ornatior, edited in ABayA XXI, 2, 1901 and translated into German, Stuttgart 1899; a smaller recension of the textus simplicior edited in ZDMG 54, 1900, 515ff. and 55, 1901, 1ff.

tions, one of which is that of the holy hunter (dharma-vyādha[1]). Through these instructions the young man becomes aware of his duties to his elders. But when he starts on a business-tour, he entrusts his two birds to the care of his wife, before he takes leave from her. Prabhāvatī spends a few days in agony caused by the separation from her husband, but she is very soon persuaded by her friends to send for a lover. When she is decorating herself to meet him, the wise crow reproaches her. But before the woman is to able to strangle its neck it manages to fly away in the right time. The wise parrot, however, approves apparently of the evil intention of Prabhāvatī. He says that she is perfectly justified to make her life happy provided she is also as smart as Guṇaśālinī. Then the woman becomes further curious, and as desired by her, the parrot narrates the story of a woman who was caught while committing adultry, but succeeded in extricating herself from the snare. At the climax of the story the narrator stops and says : "what will she do now ?" Prabhāvatī ponders over it for a long time forgetfully so that in the meantime a greater portion of the night has passed away. Then the parrot concludes his first story[3]. In this manner for 69 continuous nights he continues to begin each evening a story, in which some clever person enters, who with some trick or through some clever word or through some crafty turning knows to overcome the difficulty.

Whilst the introduction is preserved better in the textus

1. According to the Mahābhārata III, 207-219; see above I, 358; transl. p. 581.

2. The parrot-pair, that wants to arouse the feeling of virtue in a woman, is met with also in the jātaka No. 198, (cf. also 145), see above II, 102; trans. p. 127. Cf. Benfey, Pantschatantra I, 271 ff.; Gray in WZKM 18, 1904, p. 42 and M. Bloomfield, On Taking Birds in Hindu Fiction, in Festschrift Windisch, p. 349 ff. In Bāṇa's Kādambarī too there appears a clever parrot as a story-teller.

3. So unconditionally in the textus ornatior. It is ingenuous in respect of framing that the parrot that wants to prevent the woman from adultry apparently approves of her intention and advises her to go to her lover, but actually prevents her from carrying out her design by narrating stories. In the textus simplicior the parrot fails in his part, when he by mistake speaks to the woman that he will continue the story on condition that she will not go to her lover that night.

ornatior, the original conclusion appears to be missing in it, though probably it exists in the textus simplicior. On the whole both the texts present mixed recensions. Notwithstanding this we are in a position to draw a picture of the original work on their basis. So far as the form of the work is concerned, it was probably not different from that of our text : a plain and simple prose[1], that alternates with verses, of which the most are epigrams. Narrative verses are found in the beginning and at the end of the stories. The epigrams are partly in Sanskrit and partly in Prākrit. Many of aphoristic stanzas recur in other narrative works as well, particularly in the Pañcatantra[2]. Some of the stories, especially fictions, have been taken from one or the other version of the Pañcatantra, apparently from its Jaina recensions[3]. On the other hand many of the stories on adultry have entered into younger recensions of the Pañcatantra from an older version of the Śukasaptati[4].

Since 52 of the stories are common to the two recensions, we may perhaps assume that they constitute the primary stuff to the greatest extent. Half of these stories are on adultry, and most of them are of the type in which a beautiful clever woman cheats her husband who takes her unawares while she is with her paramour, but she is able to free herself from the difficulty through one or other trick. Others of these stories are of the type in which a woman who has not preserved chastity receives either an injury or disgrace, whilst the man, who commits adultry with her is cunning. The second-half of the stories are pornographical narratives of

---

1. It is also possible that many of the stories (for example 14, 23, 41, 57) may be going back to their original metrical version. Winternitz does not believe that the whole of the textus simplicior has sprung up from a metrical source, as assumed by Hertel (Festschrift Windisch, p. 141). Likewise it is also possible that many of the stories may have been taken from popular language. But we are not in a position to deduce from the Prākrit-stanzas occurring here that the work was originally written in Prākrit.

2. Cf. Hertel in BSGW 1902, p. 125 ff.

3. Cf. Hertel, WZKM 17, 1903, 343ff. and Pañcatantra, p. 234 ff. 245 ff.; Benfey, Pantschatantra I, 246 ff.; 275 ff.; 283 f.

4. So perhaps the story of the deceived husband who carries over his head the cot on which his wife is rejoicing the company of her paramour (Śukas. simpl. 24, ornat. 38), or the story mentioned above in note 3 p. 327; cf. Benfey, Pantschatantra I, 372 f., 163 ff.

all sorts of tricks and pranks of women (adultry excepted), thief's stories, stories of clever judgments or of solutions of riddles[1], and lastly some stories of other sorts of cleverness. The stories on adultry and on harlots often verge to pornographical stories and some of them are outright obscene. However, it will be simply wrong to brand the whole book as a work on pornography. The work must not be measured with the standard of the West, but first of all we ought to make a comparison between it and the corresponding works of European literature of earlier centuries. Frequently striking in these stories is the misuse of religion for the purpose of cheating. So (in the third story) the goddess Ambikā lends the form of Vimala to the cheat Kuṭila with the intention of helping him in committing adultry. In other narratives the woman who has violated her chastity makes cash-payment towards performance of some religious ceremony for the purpose of happiness of her husband, or in which she persuades her husband that her lovers expelled from the house are the people of the landlord, etc. It is not seldom that the meeting takes place in a temple and there is a verse in which wedding feasts, procession, temples, places of visit and opera-feasts are enumerated among the places and occasions for beginning of love-affairs.

It is not possible to decide with certainty as to who was the author of the original Śukasaptati or when was it written[2]. The work has been often translated into modern popular languages[3]. The famous Persion translation T u t i n a m e h

1. For example the stories, in which a magistrate has to decide as to whom does a woman belong, when her real husband and an imposter lay claim on her (3, 4), or those of Mūladeva, who has to decide in a quarrel between two devils as to who of the two has a more beautiful wife of the two similarly appearing women (30, in the text ornat. 42).

2. The author of the textus simplicior was perhaps a Śvetāmbara Jaina, whose name is not known, and that of the textus ornatior, a Brāhmaṇa, C i n t ā m a ṇ i b h a ṭ ṭ a by name. Cf. H e r t e l, Pañcatantra, p. 240 ff. According to Hertel the textus ornatior was fashioned out of the Pañcatantra and, therefore, must have been written after 1199 A. D. On the other hand the Yogaśāstra of Hemacandra, written after 1160 A. D., mentions the "70 stories of a parrot" (H e r t e l, ibid 234 ff.).

3. H e r t e l (Festschrift Windisch, 138 ff.) has studied into an interesting translation in an Eastern Rājasthānī dialect, the Suvābahuttarīkathā. This translation has been made from a Sanskrit rendering, that has

has become of the greatest importance for world-literature. Already in the beginning of the 14th century A.D. there was a Persian translation of the Śukasaptati, but that was crude and clumsy. This imperfect translation induced Nachschabi, a contemporary of Hāfiz and of Sādi to prepare an ornate work[1]. On Nachshabi's "Parrot-book" is based the Persian rendering by Kadiri made in the 18th or in beginning the 19th century[2], and one hundred years after Nachshabi was prepared the Turkish version[3]. Nachshabi has, as he himself states, omitted many of the inappropriate stories and has substituted for them other Indian stories particularly from the Vetālapañcaviṁśati. Through the Tutinamh many Indian stories have gained currency in West Asia and in Europe[4]. No story has become so famous in world-literature as the 15th one of the Śukasaptati (text simpl.[5]) of the falsified divine judgment, that has attained great fame in the "Tristan and Isolde"[6] by Gottfried von Strassburg.

as its outhor a poet Devadatta, son of Puruṣottamadāsa. It contains a fine version of the "Salomonic judgment", in which the decision is pronounced by a wise girl (see Benfey, Kleine Schriften II, 156 ff. and above II, 112; transl. p. 138). The stories of this version have been translated by Hertel, Ind. Märchen, p. 320 ff. Of little interest is the Marāṭhī-translation that has been rendered into German and published by R. Schmidt (Leipzig 1897, AKM X, 4),

1. In the year 1330 A. D., according to P. Horn, Geschichte der persischen Litteratur, Leipzig 1901, p. 212 f.

2. See Hertel, Das Pañcatantra p. 244.

3. On Nachshabi's Tutinameh, see Pertsch in ZDMG 21, 1867, 505-551. The version of Kadiri, that contains only 35 stories, had been translated into German by C. J. L. Iken in 1822 A. D. Goethe was full of admiration for this translation and commended it as a tasteful composition in respect of the translation of the Śukasaptati promised by Kosegarten (sämtliche Werke, edited by Goedeke, Bd. 8, 364 f.). A new impression of Iken's translation of the "Persischen Papageienbuchs" with an introduction by R. Schmidt has appeared as vol. 21 of the "Kulturhistorischen Liebhaberbibliothek". The Turkish version of the Tutinameh (with 73 stories) has been translated into German also as vol. 17 in the "Bibliothek der Romane" in the Inselverlag by George Rosen (Leipzig 1858). Cf. also Hertel, Pañcatantra 239 ff.

4. There are also two Malayan versions of the Parrot-book; see Pertsch, ZDMG 22, 568. Many of them have been taken into the Mongolian collection "Ardshi Bordshi" too.

5. In the textus simplicior the same story occurs as No. 24, but without the judgment of the god.

6. The oldest datable form of this story, that takes us back at least to the 5th century A. D., is the one in which a paramour is mad and takes hold of his beloved within his arms, so that she can swear that she had not the occasion of having any person other than this fool in between her arms;

Like other famous works of Indian literature the Śukasaptati too has repeatedly been imitated by later-day writers and indeed both in Sanskrit and in popular languages[1]. One such imitation, composed in ślokas in the fashion of the purāṇas, is the D i n ā l ā p a n i k ā ś u k a s a p t a t i, "the seventy stories of a parrot in daily conversation[2]". A remarkable version of the Śakuntalā-legend is narrated as the story of the 16th day.

A famous book of world-literature that with a high degree of probability can be considered to be going back to an original Indian work, that is not available and stands in close relation to the Śukasaptati in respect of its subject-matter, is the Book of S i n d b ā d. The Arabic writer M a s ū d i, who died in 956 A.D., says about the Kitāb el Sindbād that it had come from India. In essence this work is the same as the Persian Sindībād-nāmeh, a version included in Nachshabi's Tutinameh, the Syrian book, Sindban, the Arabic version, that is found under the title "The Seven Wazirs" in many manuscripts of "Thousand and One Nights", the Hebrew version, under the title Sindabar, the Greek book Syntipas and lastly the "Seven Wise Masters" of the region of European literature, that depend on them[3]. The introduction, that is very like that of the Pañcatantra, is Indian. In the Sindbad too a king makes over his son to the care of a wise man, who promises to make him in six months so wise "that on the whole of the earth no wiser man will be found". Indian is also the idea that stories are to be told for the purpose of saving some person's life, here that of a prince, who is condemned to death. Most of the stories are retold in one or the other Indian narrative

it has been translated by C h a v a n n e s, Cinq Cents Contes I, No. 116 from the Chinese Tripiṭaka. The motif has been inapropriately used in the jātaka No. 62. On a Mongolian version see B. J ü l g, Mongolische Märchen, Erzählung aus der Tristan und Isolde, monogolisch und deutsch, Innsbruck 1867. Cf. A. P f u n g s t, Aus der indischen Kulturwelt, Stuttgart 1904, 115 ff., Z a c h a r i a e, Kleine Schriften 282 f., and particularly J. J. M e y e r, Isoldes Gottesurteil, Berlin 1914, p. 74 ff.

1. A list of such imitations has been is given by R. S c h m i d t, Vier Erzählungen aus der Śukasaptati, p. 6 ff.

2. Specimens with German translation by R. S c h m i d t, ZDMG 45, 1891, 629 ff.; 46, 1892, 664 ff.

3. On the whole of this literature see V. C h a u v i n, Bibliographies des ouvrages Arabes, t. VIII.

work, so the story of killing of the innocent mongoose in the Pañcatantra, but especially the stories of adultery and over all the stories of wickedness of women. It almost seems that in this respect the work was meant to be a supplement to the Pañcatantra, a book of lessons, with which young men could be appraised of the trickeries of women and be warned against them[1].

Less certain is the Indian origin of "Thousand and One Nights", although this work in its framing shows great similarity with works like the Vetālapañcaviṁśati, the Vikramacarita and Śukasaptati and the contains other stories that are doubtlessly Indian[2]. J. Charpentier[3] has, in a Jaina commentary of the 11th century A.D., found as frame of a series of narratives, the story of queen Kanayamañjarī, who will like to have the king devoted to her exclusively and therefore, every night before going to sleep she asks her maidservant to begin a story that she should continue the next evening. By this curiosity is aroused in the king, so that for six months he discards all other women and always sleeps with Kanayamañjarī alone. Charpentier sees in this the model of Sheherzade and presumes that the Pahlavi original of the Arabic collection may have been translated from an Indian popular language. About the frame of the "Thousand and One

1. Comparetti (Ricerche intorne al Libro di Sindbad, Milano 1869) and Th. Benfey (Pantschatantra I, 12 f., 23, 38 ff., 503 ff. and Kleinere Schriften II, 27 ff.) have already pointed to the Indian origin of the book of Sindbad. This evidence has been made complete by S. Warren (Het indische origineel van den Griekschen Syntipas. Verslagen en Medev. der kon. Akad. van Wetensch., s. IV, t. 5, p. 41 ff), who has shown that many distarted and unintelligible passages in Greek syntipas are not different from the unfortunate translations of famous Indian epigrammatic stanzas. "In case a conclusion can at all be allowed to be deduced from analogies, it will appear that the original Arabic text is a faithful reproduction of the Pahlavi text and this one goes back to the Indian original", Nöldeke, ZDMG 33, 524. Cf. also Hertel, ZDMG 55, 1901, 488. On the Indian origin of the book of Sindbad, cf. Hertel, ZDMG 74, 1920, 458 ff., who has traced the story of the "cheated cheat" in a Jaina Sanskrit text of a poem of 548 stanzas, Ratnacūḍakathā of Jñānasāgara (middle of the 15th century A. D.) and in a poem in old Gujarātī.

2. We have a great number of stories and motives in the "Thousand and One Nights" that are doubtlessly of Indian origin and the whole layout of the work like Schachtelgeschichte, is not of minor Indian origin August Müller, Bezz. Beitr. 13, 1888, 225 ff., 239 ff. Ind. Stud. 15, 212 ff.; Gray, WZKM 18, 1904, 39 ff. and ERE VI, p. 3.

3. Paccekabuddhageschichten 134, 146 ff. see above II 321, Trans. p. 433.

Nights" E. Cosquin[1] has shown that all the chief constituents rest on Indian motives. But the facts do not warrant the statement that the Pahlavi basic work was wholly translated from some Indian language. It will be prudent to assume that a Persian poet had planned the frame and the series of stories in imitation of some Indian original[2]".

Many Sanskrit works of narrative literature have been probably taken recently from popular languages into Sanskrit. Apparently of this type is the Bharaṭakadvātriṁśikā[3], "Thirty two stories of the Bharaṭakas" (a class of beggar-monks). They are stories of foolish and wicked people meant exclusively for ridiculing the priests.

For example here we find the story of the mendicants, who build a chain for the purpose of reaching the heaven, and the first of them firmly fastens the chain to the tail of the heavenly wish-cow (Kāmadhenu), and when he wants to show to his companion the dimensions of pancakes that they will be offered in the heaven to eat, he loses hold of the tail of the Kāmadhenu and all the mendicants fall on the earth. Another famous story is of a simpleton, who cuts the branch of a tree on which he is sitting and takes the man, who tells him that he will fall down, to be a great prophet, and gives so much credence to his talk that he lets himself die[4].

1. La Prologue Cadre des milles et une nuits etc. (Extr. de la Revue biblique), Paris 1909.

2. However, it is noteworthy that even the stories of Sindbad and Ahiqār (see above II, 111; trans. p. 137) taken into the "Thousand and One Nights" have so many parallels in Indian narrative literature.

3. Individual stories from this work communicated by Aufrecht, ZDMG 14, 1860, 569 ff.; and Festgruss Roth 129 ff.; Weber, Indische Streifen I, 245 ff.; P. E. Pavolini, SIFI 1, 1897, 51 ff.; Hertel, Indische Märchen, p. 148 ff. According to Hertel, (ibid 376 f.) the book conceals "under the harmless form of popular fools' stories opposition of the Jainas against the Śaiva monks, whom they hated most on account of the bloody sacrifices practised by them". In the stories neither about Jainism nor about a "polemic writing" much is to be found. Probably they were collected together by a Jaina for ridiculing the Bharaṭakas. J. Hertel has edited the Bharaṭakadvātriṁśikā (Sächsische Forschungsinstitute in Leipzig, Ind. Abt. No. 2, 1921) and in vol. 5 of the "Indischen Erzähler" (Leipzig 1922), and he has translated it with Somadeva's fools' stories into German. Supplement to the edition, ibid p. 194 ff. Probably the author is Munisundara, (1359-1446 A.D.).

4. This story has a large number of parallels in world literature; see R. Köhler in Orient und "Occident" I, 431 ff.; 765 ff.

A similar work is Kathārṇava, "Sea of Stories" of Śivadāsa, with 35 stories, in which occur also the stories of fools and thieves[1]. The legends of the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa have been caricatured in Haribhadra's Dhūrtākhyāna, that is written in Prākrit stanzas[2]. Puruṣaparīkṣā[3], ("Test of Man" by the poet Vidyāpati[4], a collection of stories written in the second half of the 14th century, too betrays its popular origin. There are 44 instructive stories (in prose with intercalated epigrams) that are meant for the purpose of teaching and are set in a frame-story. The apparently sober frame is as follows :—

A king has a wonderfully beautiful daughter, whom he wants to give in marriage. He asks a Brāhmaṇa as to how he will be able to find a worthy husband for her. The latter describes to him the different types of noble and ignoble persons (the "hero of generosity", the "hero of kindness", the "hero of battle" the "hero of truthfulness", the thief, the coward, the greedy, the worthless, etc.), and for each type an example is added in the form of a story. Most of these stories are not particularly interesting. But a beautiful story is the example of the man who has distinguished himself in wit (hāsavidya). IV. 13 :

Four burglars are caught while committing theft and they are ordered to be put to death. After three thieves have been impaled, the fourth one escapes by speaking to the hanger that he wants to communicate to the king the formula a powerful magic. The king becomes

---

1. Cf. Aufrecht, Bodl. Cat. p. 153 f.; Weber, Indische streifen I, 251 f.; Pavolini, GSAI 9, 189 ff.

2. Cf. E. LEUMANN in the deliberations of the 46th convention of German philologists and teachers in Strassburg, 1891, p. 193.

3. Cf. Brockhaus in BSGW 1857, p. 22 ff.; Aufrecht, Leipzig, No. 406. Editions with Gujarātī translation, published Bombay 1882. An English translation of Kalee Krishun Bahadoor, Calcutta 1830. The work has been translated also into popular languages, so in Bengali. [The best edition with Maithili translation is by Shri Ramnatha Jha. Patna 1960.]

4. The poet had received the grant of a village from King Śivasiṁha of Mithilā in 1399 A. D. (when the latter was still a crown-prince). The copper-plate grant is not existent. Vidyāpati is the author of the Durgābhakti-taraṅgiṇī, a hand-book of the Devī-cult, too. He is more famous as a writer of religious hymns in the Maithilī language of Bihar. Cf. Grierson, Ind. Ant. 14, 1885, 182 ff.

curious and allows the thief to be brought to him. He reports that he knows to grow trees of gold : gold seeds are sown on the earth. After a month a shrub grows up, of which the leaves are of pure gold. The king provides him with facilities to grow gold. The thief is given a lump of gold that is cut into smallest pieces. He ploughs a piece of land and says: "Since now the field and seeds are ready, kindly let a man be brought to sow the seeds". The king enquires from him as to why he himself does not sow. He replies : a thief cannot sow gold ; this can be done only by a person who has never stolen anything. Now it so happens that neither the king nor his minister nor the chief judge is able to assert that he has never stolen. At this the burglar says : "why then of all persons, am I alone to die ?" At this the king is so much pleased that he not only grants him his life but also makes him the gate-keeper of his court[1].

Lastly we must include under narrative literature some works that contain stories on historical personalities, but cannot be considered to form historical literature in any sense, since they contain all sorts of anecdotes, without any consideration for historical truth and without any scruple with regard to anachronisms. The works of this type are the Prabandhacintāmaṇi of Merutuṅga and Prabandhakośa of Rājaśekhara[2]. The Bhojaprabandha[3] of Ballāla too belongs to the same class of work (end of the 16th century A. D.). In these works the life and activities of courts of Indian princes, particularly literary parasitoriums, are described very nicely in a simple style in prose and verses (of which most are epigrams). But the contents are only stories that are associated with the names of the famous king Bhoja and of the poets and scholars, who are presumed to have

1. Text and translation in Brockhaus, ibid 34 ff., German also by J. J. Meyer, Daśakumāracarita, p. 69 ff. A similar story in the Kathārṇava; see Weber, Ind. Streifen 1, 251 f.

2. See above II, 332 f., Transl. p. 520.

3. Edited by Th. Pavie in JA 1854-55, s.5. t. III, 185 ff.; t. IV 385 ff.; t. V, 76 ff. with extracts translated into French by K. P. Parab, Bombay NSP 1896, by Vāsudevaśarman, Bombay NSP 1913. The great popularity of the Bhojaprabandha is proved by its large number of manuscripts and different recensions, see L. Oster, Die Rezensionen des Bhojaprabandha, Diss. Darmstadt; 1911.

lived in his court. So for example Kālidāsa is made a contemporary of Bhoja[1]. This work can in no case be considered as historical. It is unhistorical to the highest degree and has misled many of the researchers of former times[2].

ORNATE FICTION

It has already been mentioned above, that according to Indian rhetoricians metre does not constitute an essential component of poetry, rather a "kāvya" can be composed equally well in either verse or in prose or in admixture of prose and poetry[3]. "Kāvyas" in prose are the Sanskrit fictions. Of the ornate court poetry, they possess all the characteristics excepting the metre : descriptions overrun with ornate pictures and similes, unending long compounds, puns and other embellishments. However, the plot of the fiction is not taken as in the epics, or from the legends of gods and heroes, but mostly from fable-literature.

In this manner the Daśakumāracarita, "the Adventures of Ten Princes"[4] differs from works like Guṇāḍhya's Bṛhatkathā more on account of perfection in the style of ornate court poetry than in the matter of the subject-matter. Daṇḍin's work too is a cycle of tales and stories that are set in a common frame. The frame-story, in brief, is as follows :—

The king of Magadha is defeated in a battle by

---

1. Cf. the beautiful translation of the story by Hertel, Tantrākhyāyika - Übersetzung I, 13 f. See also R. Pischel, Fürst und Dichter im alten Indien (Deutsche Revue 29, 2, 1904, p. 51 ff. and Quackenbos, The Sanskrit poems of Mayūra, p. 42 ff.

2. Lassen, Ind. Altertumskude III, 836 ff., has treated the story of king Bhoja of Dhārā with the use of Bhojaprabandha and of similar Bhojacaritra. This work too has a tale-like character, but many historical conclusions are deducible from it.

3. See above p. 13 f.

4. Edited by G. Bühler and P. Peterson, Bombay 1887 and 1891 (BSS Nos. 10 and 42); an earlier edition by H. H. Wilson, London 1846. German translations by J. J. Meyer, Leipzig, Lotus-Verlag o. J. (1902) with a valuable introduction, and by H. Haberlandt (with abridgements) ,München 1903. Cf. H. H. Wilson, Works III, 342 ff; Weber, Ind. Streifen I, 308 ff; Talub-ul-Ilm. Ind. Ant. 4, 1875, 157. ff. Winternitz states that the edition of N. B. Godabole and K. P. Parab, Bombay, NSP. 1883 and that of M. R. Kale, Bombay 1917 were not available to him. A new German translation of the Daśakumāracarita had been just published by J. Hertel (Die Zehn Prinzen, ein indischer Roman von Daṇḍin, Vollständig verdeutscht, 3 vols., Indische Erzähler Bd. 1-3, Leipzig 1922).

the king of Mālava and flees away into the forest, where. his wife gives birth to a son, Prince Rājavāhana. At the same time a son is born to each of the four minister of the king, and shortly after him five different princes are brought in a wholly wonderful manner to take shelter under the former king. These ten boys, princes and ministers' sons, grow up together and are trained in all crafts and sciences in a similar manner. When they grow up, the prince with his companions starts for "victory of the world" (*digvijaya*). One day, in the Vindhya-mountains he meets a Brāhmaṇa Mātaṅga, whom he renders some help in achieving certain magical power for acquisition of mastery over the nether-world. After different adventures the prince resumes his own journey. In the meantime his companions, searching for him, go out into the world. Since the prince does not find them, he too begins to stroll about and at last comes to a park, where he meets some of his companions. One by one all the ten princes are reunited, and each of them narrates the story of his adventure, that he has experienced during the intervening period.

The stories that are narrated within this frame have very colourful contents. J. J. Meyer[1] has called the Daśakumāracarita a "Schelmenroman (knaves' fiction)" and Pischel[2] a "Sittenroman (moral fiction)" and likewise one may call it also a "tale-fiction". Some of the stories of are knave's fictions, so the stories of Apahāravarman, Upahāravarman and Arthapāla, that are full of intrigues, knaveries and scoundrel's activities. Hertel calls it a "political fiction", and in his opinion it is a narrative work meant for instruction, like the Tantrākhyāyika. But this does not appear to be correct. Although the poet has occasionally shown his knowledge of arthaśāstra, still he has planned his work as a light literature.

Prince Apahāravarman is a master-thief and scientifically schooled burglar. He speaks about larceny as a wholly honourable profession. Therein he is not a person devoid of moral grounding. He plunders a

1. In the title to his translation.
2. DLZ 1903, Sp. 3002.

city for the purpose of helping a man ruined by a harlot, so that he may regain his fortune, since he has heard that the city is full of rich miserly fellows : for this he is resolved to follow "the instruction prescribed by Karṇīsuta[1] in order to make them realise the perishability of wealth and to bring them to senses thereby". Even Upahāravarman, the hero of the second story, in his turn, who has no scruple either in respect of falsehood, or cheating or killing in his activities directed for getting possession of a queen, is declared "moralist" by Rājavāhana, who says :

paśyata pāratalpikamupādhiyuktamapi gurujanabandhavyasanamuktihetutayā duṣṭāmitrapramāpaṇābhyupāyatayā rājyopalabdhimūlatayā ca puṣkalāvarthadharmāvapyarīradhat ।

"See , even by sinful mounting the nupti l bed of another person he has earned abundant profit (*artha*) and merit (*dharma*) inasmuch as the main purpose has been to secure release from arrest his venerable elders and it has been the means of killing a wicked enemy and that of the root of attainment of a kingdom."

All the stories are full of tale-like branches and rare adventures. The complication of treatment sometimes reaches to such a degree that the reader often gets tired in loosening the thread of the story. In all the stories miracle plays such a great rôle that it significantly interferes with suspense. Everything , for example, is ordained from before. All happens as it must happen. But this takes place, not on the ground of some internal necessity, but as a sequence to some curse, a predestination, a dream, a prophesy, etc. The arbitrary nature of tales prevails everywhere. When there is something bad with the hero, the reader has no fear about him, since it is known from before that he will somehow be relieved of it. Everywhere strong eroticism prevails. With predilection the poet tarries when he describes the beauty of women and when he paints love-scenes. Many of these places do not only prove Daṇḍin's thorough knowledge of the kāmaśāstra, but also of real poetry. Full of thoughtful colour-splendour is, for example, the description from the beginning of the fifth chapter, where Pramati narrates, how he falls asleep in

1. Author of a work on theft.

the forest and suddenly wakes up in the company of beautiful women and finds himself close to the most wonderful princes Navamālikā, the most beautiful of all of them.

That our poet does not lack in humour is demonstrated by the story of Ṛṣi Marīci and the harlot Kāmamañjarī:—

One day the harlot rushes forth into the hermitage of Ṛṣi Marīci after declaring that she is determined to lead a forest-life. The mother of the harlot follows her and protests against her adopting this course. The sage decides that she may live in the hermitage for a day, know the forest-life, return back to her mother and then again follow her profession. But the harlot serves the sage with great love and attention, and she does not take a long time to make the sage begin to love her fully. To a harlot's talk on virtues he retorts with a talk about the love-god. Lastly she invites him to the town on the occasion of the love-feast where she appears with the age, who is entirely captivated by her, in a royal park, where it is promptly declared that the harlot had made a bet that she would allure Ṛṣi Marīci with her charms. After she has won the bet, she bids the sage farewell, who returns back to his hermitage ashamed and full of remorse. Through this lesson he finds again the path to attainment of peace[1].

In respect of language Daṇḍin shows himself as a master of the kāvya-style overburdened with embellishments that of course alternate with the simple language of the plain narrator. Here is an example of the poet's metaphorical language :—

After this the above-mentioned sage Marīci to whom Apahārvaman has narrated his story, *tanmanaś cyutatamaḥsprasabhiyevāstaṁ raviragāt ṛṣimuktaśca rāgaḥ sandhyātvenāsphurat tatkathādattavairāgyāṇīva kamalavānāni samakucan.*

1. That this story of Marīci is a transformation of the legend of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga, as meant by Lüders, NGGW 1897, 109, is not believed by W. Cf. also J. J. Meyer, Das Weib im altindischen Epos, p. 407 f. The story may be compared also with the legend of Saint Martinianus, but Garbe (Indien und das Christentum, p. 116 f. A) rightly considers the similarity as accidental. In both the stories, there is a harlot who bets that she will allure a sage, but the rest is wholly different. But the stories of alluring holy men are so frequent in Indian as well as in Christian literature that we can hardly think of dependence of the one on the other.

"The sun set as if out of fear of touching the dark that had leaked out of his mind. And the lustre of love discarded by the sage shone forth as the evening-glow. The lotus-forests folded themselves as if they had been given freedom from passion"[1].

The entire chapter VII is a stylish ornate work, in which there occurs not a single labial sound[2], since the lips of the narrator Mantragupta have been wounded by his struggling beloved in their amorous sport. It is no wonder that there the language has become very bombastic, so when Mantragupta narrates: *nakṣatrasantānahārayaṣṭyagragrathitaratnaṁ kṣaṇadāndhakāra-gandhahastidāraṇaikakesariṇaṁ kanakaśailaśṛṅgaraṅgalāsyalīlānaṭaṁ gaganasāgaraghanataraṅgarājilaṅghanaikacakraṁ kāryākāryasākṣiṇaṁ sahasrārciṣaṁ sahasrākṣadigaṅganāṅga-rāgarāgāyitakiraṇajālaṁ raktranīrañjalimārādhya nijaniketa-tanaṁ nyaśiśriyam*; "I returned home having worshipped the sun, the jewel strung at the top of the garland of the line of the stars, the lion, who alone tears asunder the elephant in rut of darkness, the dancer who dances at the peak of the mountain of gold, the o n l y crocodile who traverses the surface of the thick waves of the ocean of the sky, who is a witness of noble and ignoble activities, who has thousand rays, whose net of rays is painted with the sandal of the body of the lady of the direction of the thousand-eyed god "with offerings of red lotuses[4]".

As regards the height of the creative talents of Daṇḍin it is hardly difficult for us to arrive at a decision as to how far the stories have been composed by his own-self or have been worked upon some older sources. Probably the writer took the motif of the frame-story from the Bṛhatkathā of

1. Translation from the German rendering of M e y e r, p. 212 (text ed. G o d a b o l e, p. 89).

2. In the Kāvyādarśa 3, 83 Daṇḍin himself states that this ornate piece is particularly difficult. "In fact, when somebody hears the seventh chapter read aloud he has actually the impression as if somebody is reciting it with wounded lips (J a c o b i , ZDMG 40, 1886, 99 f.).

3. So also Ratnāvalī, Act III, V, 49. J. J. M e y e r (p. 324), following W., appears to have read *ekanakram* for H-*cakram*. P e t e r s o n (text II, p. 46) does not give a variant reading for *nakram*.

4. That is Indra, the defender of the East. The quarters are of the female sex.

Guṇāḍhya, since in the Kathāsaritsāgara (chapters 69-103) we find the story of a prince, who had ten ministers' sons as his companions, who were separated from each other as a sequel to a curse and after their reunion each of them narrated his own experience. In other stories as well we find many parallels and harmonies between the Kathāsaritsāgara and the Daśakumāracarita. They make it apparent that the poet knew the Bṛhatkathā and had utilized it. Since many of the stories occur also in the jātaka-books, in any case, it is certain that Daṇḍin had not composed all the stories himself[1].

The Daśakumāracarita is of great interest for cultural history. In particular we get an insight into the life and activities of unworthy people, rogues, buffoons, thieves, gamblers, and harlots. We see here amongst others a presentation of buffoons, over whose head stands a Brāhmaṇa. Here we are able to know about the life in a gambling den and we can see the practices of a poison-doctor being ridiculed. We find here described the fight of cocks and a detailed picture of the ball-dance of a princess. We obtain a thorough knowledge about the condition of life of harlots. The profession of harlots is as ordained by the creator and is under the protection of the king. The story of Nimbavatī in chapter VI throws remarkable sidelight on sexual relationships and on the position of women in society. The story of Vīrabhadra in chapter VIII is important (also for the history of nītiśāstra), where the daily course of king's life is described more minutely and in apparent agreement with the Kauṭilīya-Arthaśāstra.

Unfortunately the Daśakumāracarita has not come down to us in an intact form. The original work must have been developed from an introduction and the stories of ten princes. But the beginning and the end got lost early, so that

1. The vetāla-stories are included in the story of the sixth minister in the Kathāsaritsāgara. Similarly in the Daśakum. in Mitragupta's story of the sixth "*kumāra*" are included four stories, of which the 4th one, that is of Nitambavatī, that has the common tendency with one of the vetāla-stories, in which the hero attains his goal through the crude trick that he practises on his wife under the suspicion of her being a witch. Cf. Charpentier, Paccekabuddhageschichten, p. 143 ff; Lacôte, Essai sur Guṇāḍhya 289. Here we find also the story of the ungrateful wife (also in the Kathāsaritsāgara 65, 2 ff. and the jātaka No. 193, see above II, 104; transl. p. 130) and of the ideal wife who can prepare a dainty dish out of paddy-straws (in the jātaka No. 546 narrated with much wit and humour).

the genuine text contains only seven stories and the beginning of the eighth one. But our text begins with a section (*pūrvapīṭhikā*) that contains not only, as might be expected, the introduction (on the birth and early youth of the ten young men), but also the stories of two princes and also the beginning of the story of Rājavāhana. This *pūrvapīṭhikā* is the composition of a later writer, who has attempted to imitate the style of Daṇḍin. The last story has remained incomplete[1].

As a master of "crooked speech" (vakrokti), Subandhu, the author of the fiction Vāsavadattā[2], enjoys high reputation in India. Bāṇa says that before the ' Vāsavadattā" pride of poets sank down[3]. A century later Vākpati (Gaüḍavaha, verse 800) says about himself that he enjoyed the poetry of Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Subandhu and Haricandra. And

1. In many manuscripts the *pūrvapīṭhikā* is wanting, a thing that is a strong proof for its not being genuine. Another attempt made to complete the work of Daṇḍin is one Daśakumārcaritapūrvapīṭhikā in verses of Vināyaka and yet another is the Daśakumāra kathāsāra, likewise in verses, of Appayya Mantrin (or Appayāmātya). Moreover, the Daśakumārakathāśeṣa, in 5 ucchvāsas, of Dīkṣita Cakrapāṇi is a continuation of the work of Daṇḍin. Lastly Mahārājādhirāja Gopīnātha in his Daśakumārakathā claims to have improved upon Daṇḍin's work, but in fact he has, under insignificant alterations and additions, merely added his own introduction and his own conclusion; see Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. VII, p. 1551 ff. Meyer, Introduction to his translation, p. 134 ff. has tried to defend the authenticity of the pūrvapīṭhikā. R. Schmidt (ZDMG 64, 1910, 476) is satisfied with one "non liquet". But most of the researchers are unanimous in declaring it as spurious. Cf. A. Gawroński, Sprachliche untersuchungen über das Mṛcchakaṭika und das Daśakumāracarita, Diss. Leipzig 1907, p. 45 ff; Charpentier, Paccekabuddhageschichten, p. 144 f.; Lacôte in Mélanges Lévi, p. 267. Hertel (Die zehn Prinzen, Bd. 3) has now with the help of documents proved that the pūrvapīṭhikā is spurious. He believes (vol. 3, p. 46) that Daṇḍin never completed either its beginning or the end. As regard the beginning W. says that he does not think this opinion as probable. It is, however, possible, that the work was never completed.

2. Standard edition of Fitzedward Hall with the commentary of Śivarāma Tripāṭhin in the Bibl. Ind. Calcutta 1859, translated into English by L. H. Gray (with reprint of the transcription of the Telugu edition, Madras 1862) New York CUIS, Vol. 8, 1913. Cf. Weber, Indische Streifen I, 369 ff.

3. Bāṇa (Harṣacarita v. 12) does not mention Subandhu as the author of the "Vāsavadattā".It is not probable that he means Bhāsa's "Vāsavadattā", because Bhāsa has been mentioned in v. 16. However, there was a much older *ākhyāyikā* with the title "Vāsavadattā" that has been referred to by Patañjali (on Pāṇ. 4, 3, 87), and materially it cannot be concluded that this is meant by Bāṇa. But the researches of W. Cartellieri (WZKM 1, 1887, 155, ff.), Thomas, (ib. 12, 1898, 21 ff.) and Mankowski (ibid 15, 1901, 246 f.) have shown that Bāṇa had imitated Subandhu and had tried to surpass him, and it can hardly be doubted that in this verse he means the "Vāsavadatttā" of Subandhu.

still in later centuries Subandhu is mentioned among the earliest poets[1]. We know nothing about the life of this writer and we do not find his any other work mentioned anywhere. Subandhu has nothing in common with the drama of Bhāsa except the name of the heroine. It is not known what was the source whence Subandhu took the plot for this fiction. He has hardly created it himself. But even if he himself has composed the story he has in any case utilized a long series of current tale-motives: love in dream, talking bird, magic horse, transformation into a stone-slab etc. But it is clear that it did not occur to the poet to invent adventures and to narrate them, but rather he wanted to show his mastery in respect of the kāvya-style. His style is *Gauḍī rīti*, that is the kāvya-style over burdened with long compound words, accumulated puns, antitheses, hyperboles, ornate similes and all other possible figures of speech. A brief survey of the contents and a few probes of the style can hardly be of any use, since the style is garbed in such a different language that is totally untranslatable, a fuller representation from this little delightful work is given below :—

Kandarpaketu, the son of King Cintāmaṇi, sees in a morning-dream a young girl of wonderful beauty and begins to love desperately this dream-picture. With his friend Makaranda, he goes out in search of his beloved. They pitch their night-tent under a tree in a forest. At midnight the prince is aroused from slumber by a conversation. He watches and listens to the talk of a parrot-couple and thence learns as follows:—The king of Kusumapura has only one daughter Vāsavadattā who refuses all suitors, although she now is of marriageable age and her father has already arranged for selection of a husband by her ownself. But in a dream she sees a young man who possesses all the beauty and perfection that she likes and learns that his name is Kandarpaketu. She is overtaken with burning love for this youth. A preacher-crow is sent in search of the beloved. The latter eventually sits on a tree and immediately hands

1. Vāmana quotes the "Vāsavadattā" in his poetics. The author of an inscription of the year 808 A. D. tries to imitate the style of the Vāsavadattā; see K i e l h o r n, Ep. Ind. 6, 239 ff.

over to Kandarpaketu a love-letter written to him in verse by Vāsavadattā. Under the guidance of the love-messenger they immediately start for Kusumapura. The two lovers meet in a pleasure house in a garden and each of them begins to love the other at the very first sight: they fall into swoon, and recover fully at once. The friend, of Vāsavadattā describes to Kandarpaketu the torture of love that her mistress has undergone and in the meanwhile she says :—*tvatkṛte yānayā vedanānubhūtā sā yadi nabhaḥ patrāyate sāgaromelandāyate brahmā lipikarāyate bhujaṅgapatirvā kathakāyate tadā kathamapyanekairyuga-sahasrairabhilikhyate kathyate vā* : "The agonies of this young girl on your account can be described only if the sky becomes a leaf, the ocean, an inkpot, Brahman himself becomes the scribe, Śeṣa, the world-snake, the narrator; and still the time that will be taken to do this will be many thousands times of the age of the world"[1].

But Vāsavadattā is to be given in marriage the same day to the king of Vidyādharas according to the decision of her father. So Kandarpaketu runs away with her on his wonderful horse and returns back in a moment into the Vindhya forests. They pass the night in a hiding grove. In the morning they are tired and fall fast asleep. When Kandarpaketu wakes up he finds that Vāsavadattā has already disappeared. He searches for her in vain, and is so much perplexed that he wants to commit suicide. But a heavenly voice, that promises to unite him with her, prevents him from doing this. For many months he lives in the forest. There one day, while strolling about, he sees a stone-bust, that looks like his beloved, embraces it—and Vāsavadattā

1. As Zachariae (Gurupūjākaumudī, p. 39) has shown that this passage (ed. Hall, p. 238 ff.) goes back to an old verse. The same idea recurs also in the Talmud and in the Koran, in the German folk-song ("Und wenn der Himmel Papiere wär" etc.) and in songs of many other nations, as shown by R. Köhler (Kleinere Schriften III, 293 ff.) and A. Herrmann (Ethnologische Mitteilungen aus Ungarn I, 1887, p. 12 ff., 211 ff., 319 ff.; supplement by R. Köhler, ibid p. 312 ff.), Zachariae (ZVV 11, 1901, 331) shows a passage in Ph. Baldaeus in his book on India (1672) where the deeds of Kṛṣṇa are described with the same hyperbole.

lovingly stands before him. She has gone away to collect fruits for her beloved and is knocked down by two mutually fighting heroes, who in the fight not only strike one-another but also destroy the hermitage of a sage. The sage mistakes Vāsavadattā to be the cause of the mischief and curses her to be transformed into a slab of stone, but he tones down the curse by saying that she will regain her real form, as soon as she is touched by her lover.

Much more important than this tale for Subandhu is the description of persons with unendingly lengthy high epithets, descriptions of the night, of the moon, of the sunrise, of the sunset, of the spring, of the rains etc. He possesses mastery in the use of words and expressions having two meanings. For example Kandarpaketu is described as one "who like the spring has distributed pleasures to many thickets", that may be rendered also as: "who like the spring has offered much pleasure to different beautiful women. The beauty of Vāsavadattā, as seen in dream by the prince, is sketched in ornate pictures in which the poet manifests his accurate knowledge of kāmaśāstra and does not omit a single physical charm of the beautiful woman[1]. The swelling breasts, the slender body and the heavy hips are especially described with bold similes: for example, "she is ornamented with a look that has become quite small with anxiety that she (the look) can not see her moon-like face that has become curved under the weight of her high breasts, or likewise on account of the fatigue caused by the pressure of the tough round hips and the pitcher-like breasts...... she is sparkling with her golden breasts that resemble coffers filled with diamonds of love, that are visible seal-like nipples, or that they are fixed in the spike-like nipples for fear of tumbling down on account of their extraordinary growth,......and they are like little houses in which the god of love, tired in course of his conquest of the three worlds, has taken his abode, etc."

The beauty of Vāsavadattā, as it is actually seen for the first time by Kandarpaketu, is described in a multi-

1. He occasionally mentions also one Kāmasūtra of Mallanāga.

tude of puns, that may appear to the people of the West so tasteless, but probably they charm the Indian paṇḍitas the most, since they prove the poet's knowledge of all sciences. For example, it is said: "she has painted her feet red (*raktapāda*) like grammar", (since *raktapāda* may also mean "underlined in red for analysis"); "she has beautiful joints (*suparvans*) like the Mahābhārata" (the sections of the Mahābhārata too are called *parvans*); "she is like logic because of her shining beauty (*uddyotakarasvarūpī*), since it is said in respect of logic that it attained its final form through Uddyotakara, the famous author" etc.

In the description of nature Subandhu has an inexhaustible source of similies: so the stars are like the froth of the foam, emitted by the sun's panting horses tired on account of their journey in the sky; they raise the doubt, whether they are not white lotus-blossoms in the great lake of the sky; they look like zeroes that the creator has written on the ink-black antelope - hide, namely the dark for the purpose of expressing the absolute voidness of the *saṁsāra* at the time of calculation of creations ... and they are comparable to the tear-drops of the residents of the heaven who are weeping on account of disappearance of the sun." The rising sun is red "as if with the blood of the elephant of darkness killed by the lion of the morning crimson with his paws...like a vessel of melted iron......like the red the ante-curtain of the great actor time", etc.

The descriptions in unendingly long passages with endlessly long compound words are often intercepted by very small expressions that are meant to describe some sentiment. So for example in a description of the night the dialogue...wholly small passages, full of expressions having two meanings reproduce the nocturnal activities of the lovers.

The large number of extant commentaries on the Vāsavadattā[1] on one hand prove great popularity of the work, especially in scholarly circles, and on the other they show how difficult it is.

1. They have been enumerated by Hall, Preface p. 43. On Śivarāma's commentary see Gray, JAOS 24, 1903, 57 ff.

The author of the second famous fiction is Bāṇa (Bāṇabhaṭṭa), the first poet, about whose life and age we know more surely. He lived in the court of king Harṣavardhana of Thānesar (606-648 A.D.), and as his court-poet wrote his main work the Harṣacarita (Life and Deeds of Harṣa)[1]. It is a historical novel in prose with only a few verses scattered here and there[2]. In the introductory stanzas. that form a kind of foreword, he praises Vyāsa, the poet of the Mahābhārata, as the highest of all among his predecessors, the prose-writers Subandhu and Haricandra, the poem-writer Sātavāhana (Hāla), the epic writer Pravarasena, the dramatists Bhāsa and Kālidāsa and the story-teller Guṇāḍhya, the author of the Bṛhatkathā. Then he generally speaks about poery. He requires in poetry a new subject, fine judicious expressions, unusual play of words, a clearly expressed sentiment and an elegant language". These requirements are actually fulfilled in his work. In the matter of style he competes with Subandhu[3], whom he hardly reaches in respect of play of words and artifices, but still stands far above him in real poetical genius. His plays of words in fact often are witty, his pictures and similes are not artificial, but indeed poetically fashioned. Fortunately the admixture of poetry and truth occurs both in the narrative and descriptive parts[4], in which we cannot easily distinguish between poetry and truth. Above

1. Edited with Śaṅkara's commentary by A. A. Führer, Bombay 1909 (BSS). Translated into English by E. B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas, London 1897. Cf. Bhāu Dāji in JBRAS X, 1871, 38 ff; Führer in OC VI Leiden III, 2, 199 ff.; R.W. Fraser, Literary History of India, p. 255 ff. The English translation is based on the edition published in NSP, 1892. On the two recent editions of the Harṣacarita (by P. V. Kane, Bombay 1918, and by S. D. and A. B. Gajendragadkar Poona 1919) see F.W. Thomas, JRAS 1920, p. 384 ff.

2. In the main colophon the work is mentioned as a *mahākāvya*, but in the introductory verses (20 f.) Bāṇa himself calls it an *ākhyāyikā*. So all the manuals of poetics. Cf. Lacôte in Mélanges Lévi 268 f.

3. See above p. 394, note 3.

4. As a work of history the Harṣacarita is of limited value. It is significant that Bāṇa tells us that his hero was born "in the month of Jyaiṣṭha, on the 12th day of the dark fortnight, at the moment when the tulā (libra) was in ascension, immediately after the time of the dusk, when the baby night had just begun to rise up", but the year of his birth is not given. Yet many of the statements of Hiuen-Tsiang and of the inscriptions are supplemented and corrected by the valuable information given by Bāṇa; see Bühler, Vikramāṅkadevacarita, Introd. p. 4 f; Ep. Ind. 1, 67 ff; 4, 208 ff; and Rapson, JRAS 1898, 448 ff.

all true are the numerous descriptions of the life in the court, the usages, customs and religious conditions of the age. For the latter in particular the Harṣacarita is of unestimable value. Bāṇa comes of a Brāhmaṇa family, in which religious ceremonies are strictly observed. Hence he is perhaps thoroughly conversant with all the religious practices and he never misses an opportunity to describe the religious ceremonies, that are observed on the birth of a child, at the time of a marriage, after death, at the start on a sujourn, on home-coming, while marching into the battle and on all other possible occasions. On each such occasion the presents that are made to Brāhmaṇas are mentioned. In respect of cults, however, the offerings and ceremonies in honour of Śiva, Durgā and the Mother prevail. Often the topic is about the Śaiva sect and ascetics. Astrology and favourable and unfavourable omens as well as the means of protection against the latter do not play an insignificant rôle. But numerous other cults and sects are mentioned. Harṣa's father was a sun-worshipper. Harṣa himself appears in chapter VIII as a distinguished friend of Buddhists and direct adherent of Buddhism. Interesting is, however, the enumeration of the followers of different sects and mendicants who crowd a forest-hermitage described here[1]. The poet speaks about all the religious sects with equal veneration. However, he is still sufficiently worldly and does not miss the opportunity to hurl unkind criticisms at the mendicants of the different sects; so for example in the beautiful enumeration of the beings that are difficult to be found in the world[2] :

yadyapi ca vibhuranabhimāno dvijātiraneṣaṇo muniraroṣaṇaḥ kapiracapalaḥ kaviramatsaro vaṇigataskaraḥ priyajānirakuhanaḥ sādhuradaridro draviṇavānakhalaḥ kīnāśonakṣigataḥ mṛgayurahiṁsraḥ pārāśarī brāhmaṇyaḥ sevakaḥ sukhī kitavaḥ kṛtajñaḥ gopyaḥ priyavāgamātyaḥ satyavādī rājasūnuradurvinītaśca.................'

"A prince having no pride, a Brāhmaṇa, not seeking any gain, a sage, who does not get angry, a monkey, that is not unsteady, a poet who has no jealousy, a

1. Ed. Führer, p. 316, English translation, p. 236. —*vītarāgairārhatairmaskarībhiḥ śvetapaṭaiḥ pāṇḍurabhikṣubhirbhāgavatairvarṇibhiḥ...........anyaiśca svān svān siddhāntāñchṛṇvadbhirabhiyuktaiścintayadbhiḥ...........*

2. Ed. Führer, p. 249, English translation p. 171 f.

trader, who is not a thief, a husband who is not vindictive, a noble man, who is not poor, a wealthy person, who is not wicked, a niggard, who is not a thorn in the side, a hunter, who is not ferocious, a Pārāśarya monk, who may be a pious Brāhmaṇa, a servant, who is happy, a gambler, who is grateful, a mendicant, who is not a ravenous[1], a slave, who gives friendly advice, a minister, who speaks the truth, a king's son, who is not discourteous."......"

In the first two chapters Bāṇa tells his biography that contains extraordinarily valuable statements about his life.

The poet begins with the statement that he narrates a legendry history of his family of the Vātsyāyanas[2], wholly in the style of the purāṇas.-- But after this he reports in a wholly historical fashion about his birth, his early education and lastly his vocation in the court of King Harṣa. He was a son of a Brāhmaṇa Citrabhānu and of the Brāhmaṇī Rājadevī. When still a boy he lost his mother, and in the 14th year after his birth also his father, who had become his second mother and whom he loved cordially. In the beginning he bemoans on account of the bereavement, but soon he finds himself in a bad company and commits many heinous crimes, due to which he attains notoriety. In fact it was a remarkable Bohemian, about whom young Bāṇa, according to his own story, used to move about : there were poets, amongst whom there were also such ones as composed in popular languages, musicians of all types, begging mendicants of different sects and all classes of nuns, a snake-charmer, a young doctor, a reader, a goldsmith, a scribe, two singers, a painter, an actor, an actress, a chamber-maid, a magician, a buffoon, etc. His parents had left to him a handsome heritage, but his lust for adventure carried him to foreign regions, where he made great travels for

1. This is wanting in Führer's edition.

2. We are obliged to leave the question of deciding whether we have here a tradition current in the family or if it is purely a fabrication of the poet in imitation of the purāṇa-legends. Winternitz considers the latter as probable.

the purpose of seeing foreign countries. After he had whiled away his youth in such an unrestrained manner, by and by he learnt about the life in court and in society of clever and wise people and got trained in traditional and spiritual practices prevalent in the family of the Vātsyāyanas. And when in course of years he returned back to his native land he was greeted by members of his family "as if on some feast." After he lived at home with his relations for a long time, there came one day a message from his friend Kṛṣṇa, king's brother, that the latter asked him to come to the court of the king, since it was not right that he passed his life away from the court, "like a fruitless tree far away from the rays of the sun". After some deliberation he resolved to follow the vocation. He quits his native place and joins the court of King Harṣa, whose love and confidence of the highest degree he wins very soon. After he has spent some time in the court[1], he goes to meet one of his relations in his native land. He is received, honoured and greeted. A reader is ready to read from the Vāyupurāṇa. On this occasion a singer compares the deeds described in the purāṇas with those of Harṣa, that induces a cousin of the poet to request him to narrate the story of Harṣa. After some modest hesitation Bāṇa agrees to abide by this request.

In many places the narrative itself is as interesting as the description of persons. So the descriptions of localities and situations as well as the descriptions of nature occupy much space, in which bold pictures and similes are as little wanting as puns. Only a few probes from Bāṇa's style can be given here[2].

The panegyric description of Harṣa, when Bāṇa sees

1. With this begins the third chapter and the transition to the life of Harṣa. This introduction corresponds to the usual introductions found in the purāṇas, that usually begin with the statement that a ṛṣi appears in the assembly of curious people and after a short or prolonged request he begins the story. Bāṇa has developed in an original manner, this purāṇa-type of introduction into a piece of autobiography.

2. It is in any case impossible to present an accurate account of the style of this ornate prose, since the compact Sanskrit construction (participles, compounds, locative absolute) is as unimitable as the numberless puns and alliterations are.

him for the first time, occupies not less than ten printed pages[1], that make a single sentence. "He saw Harṣa" (all that follows is expressed in participles)...

kāvyakathāsvapītamapyamṛtamudvamantam... aruṇapādapallavena sugatamantharoruṇā vajrāyudhaniṣṭhuraprakoṣṭhapṛṣṭhena vṛṣaskandhena bhāsvadviṃbādhareṇa prasannāvalokitena candramukhena kṛṣṇakeśena vapuṣā sarvadevatāvatāramivaikatra darśayantam.. vikacamukhakamalakarṇikākośena anavaratamāpīyamānaśvāsas·urabhamivādhomukhena nāsāvaṁśena...harṣamadrākṣīt-

"who was vomitting fort the nectar, that he had not drunk even in the discourses on poetry" (that is, he was reciting the poem, that he had not heard from anybody else, but had composed himself),......who was appearing, with his body with his reddish shoot-like delicate reddish foot (with the sprout of feet of Aruṇa)[2], with his beautifully slowly moving thighs (with slow thighs of Buddha), with his forearm, that was as hard as the weapon of thunderbolt (with strong arm of the holder of the thunderbolt i.e. Indra), with his shoulder of a bull (with the shoulder of the god Dharma[1]), with his brilliant lower lip (with the lower-lip of the sun-god), with his pleasant look (with the pleasant look of Avalokita) with his moon-like face (with the face of the moon-god), with his black hair (with the hair of Kṛṣṇa), like the incarnation of all gods in one body......who with his nose, that resembled the bud of a fully blossomed lotus, extending out of his face, was inhaling the fragrance of its smell etc."

About Prabhākaravardhana, the father of Harṣa, it is said that he was a quarrelsome man so much so that even the sight of his own reflection in a mirror in the sheathe of his sword that he had in his hand was painful to him[4]. "For him hostility was a present, fight, a

1. Ed. Führer, pp. 110-120, (English translation, pp. 56-64). 3 Ed. Führer, p. 175 (English translation, p. 101 f.).

2. Aruṇa was born without legs. He is the chariot-driver of the sun-god. The second meaning of each of the double-sensed compounds is given within the brackets.

3. So according to the commentary : Vṛṣan may be an epithet of Agni, Viṣṇu or Śiva.

4. *karadhṛtadhautāsiprativiṃbitenātmanāpyadūyata.*

favour; beginning of a battle, a festivity; the enemy, sight of treasure; excess of foes, a good luck; call to fight, a boon; an accidental fall, a great favour done by fate and striking with sword, shower of wealth[1].

The early bringing up of Harṣa is beautifully described. His lotus-like face shining with little teeth looked like sprouts of pleasant smile pushing up as a consequence of wetness caused by the sprinkles with the pitchers of his mother's breasts[2].

In chapter V the scene of death of King Prabhākaravardhana is . described in an attractive manner. Among the king's physicians there is one who is only 18 years old, but he is particularly clever, who loves the king sincerely and when he sees that the condition of the latter has become hopeless, burns his ownself. Whilst at this Harṣa is wholly perplexed, a maidservant of the queen comes and reports to him that his mother has made up her mind to die by burning herself in fire. Harṣa rushes forth into the female apartment. Then he is struck with the cries of the queens, who are resolved to die with their husband. They touchingly take leave of even the trees of the garden and of the birds in the cages and of maidservants. As he enters, he sees his mother, who is ready to die. In her hand "she is holding a picture of her husband so firmly, as if she is determined to die." She is decorated by her servant and by her devotion to her husband; she is firmly supported by a swoon and an old woman, both of whom are well-trusted by her; she is embraced by a friend and agony who are united with her in her trouble; she is surrounded by an attendant and pain, that have taken possession of all of her limbs; the sons of the high royal family and strong breathing are by his side and behind her are

1. *yaśca vairamupāyanaṁ vigrahamanugrahaṁ samarāgamaṁ mahotsavaṁ śatruṁ nidhidarśanam aribāhulyam abhyudayam āhavāhvānaṁ varapradānamavaskandapātaṁ diṣṭavṛddhiṁ śastraprahārapatanaṁ vasudhārāmamanyata.*
Ed. Führer, p. 175, (English translation, p. 101f.)

2. *janan īpayodharakalaśapayaḥsīkarasekādiva jāyamānairvilāsahasitāṅkurairdaśanakairalaṅkriyamāṇamukhakamalam* : Ed. Führer, p. 191 (English translation, p. 116).

standing the very old chamberlains and agonies'"[1]. Harṣa falls at the feet of the queen and implores her not to forsake him and to abstain from the decision. But she replies that she, as daughter, wife and mother of heroes, does not mind anything else so much as not to live as a widow. For her it is life, not death that is the greater evil. Harṣa is obliged to accept her argument as correct, so unfortunately it is with him too. Yaśovatī burns herself on the bank of the river Sarasvatī, and a little after this the king dies. The corpse is burnt and death ceremonies are performed. The servants and ministers of the deceased partly die and partly become ascetics or monks of different sects.

Bāṇa is a master in the description of personalities. So the military events of Field-Commander Siṁhanāda (in chapter VI) are described with greater prudence and with much more ornate puns. Splendid is the description of the commanding officers of the elephant-troups, "whereof the bridge of the nose (*nāsāvaṁśa*) is as the family-tree of his own king (*nijanṛpavaṁśa*)".

With the description of the crimson red setting sun and of the rising moon—the sunset indicates the bloody battle and the fall of Harṣa's enemies, the white moon the brilliant fame of Harṣa—ends the chapter VIII, and for us the whole work. It is not probable that this is the actual end of the work or that the poet left the work incomplete. Rather we are to assume that the end is lost to us.

The Kādambarī[2], a novel, is the second work of the poet. It remained incomplete on account of death of Bāṇa while he was working on it. It was continued and completed by the his sons Bhūṣaṇabhaṭṭa or Bhaṭṭa

1. *dhātryā bhartṛbhaktyā ca nijayā prasādhitāṁ mūrcchayā jaratyā ca nijasaṁstutayā dhāryamāṇāṁ sakhyā pīḍayā ca vyasanasaṅgatayā samāliṅgitāṁ parijanena santāpena ca gṛhītasarvāvayavena parītāṁ kulaputtrocchavasitaiśca mahattarairadhiṣṭhitāṁ kañcukibhirduḥkhaiścātivṛddhairanugatāṁ..............mātaraṁ dadarśa* (Ed. Führer, p. 229).

2. Edited by P. Peterson, Bombay 1883 BSS; translated with occasional omissions by C. M. Ridding, London 1896. Index of the contents by Peterson in the introduction to the edition of Weber, Indische Streifen I, 352 ff. and Lacôte in Mélanges Lévi 259 ff.

Pulina[1] in the style of his father. This novel rests on a tale, that we find in Somadeva's Kathāsaritsāgara (59, 22-178) and in Kṣemendra's Bṛhatkathāmañjarī (16, 183 ff.), and from this we have to assume that Bāṇa knew the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya[2]. The work consists of a series of intercalated stories in the style of narrative poetry. The story itself is of little interest. The style is similar to that of the Harṣacarita, only with this difference that corresponding to the context pain on account of love and yearning for love are the basic motif of the poem—the sentiment is a different one. In the Harṣacarita the pathos prevails and in the Kādambarī, quietism and love. Here too we find big descriptions, far-fetched similes and puns, unendingly long compounds and endless sentences. "The story", as Weber says[3], "proceeds in high-flown bombasts, under which (or at least the patience of the reader) often gets disturbed...... This prose is a real Indian forest, where progress is impossible through the undergrowth until the traveller cuts out a path for himself, and where even then he is confronted by malicious wild beasts in the shape of uncommon words to terrify him." However, it is remarkable that the monstrous words and atrocious sentences are capable of being cut into small sentences in simple and natural prose. However tiring the reading of the novel may be for the people of the West, we must keep in mind that for an Indian reader it presupposes that he has a thorough knowledge of Sanskrit and for him the work has its own charm. But when we find in a modern Bengali novel published in 1871 that the heroine in her boudoir reads the "Kādambarī", it certainly does not reflect the actual condition of life, but it merely shows that the Bengali author wants to prove his knowledge of Sanskrit literature. The "reading of this book" has never been easy, nay even for the learned Indians, so a novel that ladies read

1. So he is called in a manuscript of the year 1647 in M. A. Stein Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS at Jammu, Bombay 1894, p. 299.

2. Kṣemendra knew the work of Bāṇa. Bāṇa has probably changed the names of persons and places and has introduced into the story more of complications. The concluding portion, particularly the one completed by the son of the poet, contains many deviations. Hence he must have known the plan of his father. Cf. Mankowski in WZKM 15, 1901, 213 ff.

3. Ibid 353, Against this Lacôte (ibid p. 259) praises as "le charme de cette oeuvre tout imprégnée de tendresse, de mélancholie et d'espérance en une seconde vie".

in their boudoir for diversion could not be this. A few probes about the style and character of the work may be sufficient.

The love between Kādambarī, the heroine, a ıd Candrāpīḍa originated at the first sight as follows :—

"śeṣendriyāṇyapi me vedhasā kimiti locanamayānyeva na kṛtāni । kiṁvānena kṛtamavadātaṁ karma cakṣuṣā yadaniv:ritamenāṁ paśyati । aho citrametadutpāditaṁ vedhasā sarvaramaṇīyānāmekaṁ dhāma । kutaḥ ete rūpātiśaya-paramāṇavaḥ samāsāditāḥ । tannūnamenāmupādayato vidheḥ karatalaparāmarśakleśena ye vigalitā locanayugalādaśrujala-bindavastebhya etāni jagati kumudakamalakuvalayasaugandhi-kavanānyutpannāni" ityevaṁ cintayata evāsya t syā nayanayugale nipapāta cakṣuḥ । tadā tasyā api...cintayantyā rūpātiśaya-vilokanavismayasmeraṁ niścalanibaddhalakṣaṁ cakṣustasmin suciraṁ papāta । locanaprabhādhavalitastu kādambarīdarśana-vihvalocala iva tatkṣaṇamarājata candrāpīḍaḥ । dṛṣṭvā ca prathamaṁ romodgamaḥ । tato bhūṣaṇaravaḥ tadanu kādambarī samuttasthau । atha tasyāḥ kusumāyaudha eva svedamajanayat । sasaṁbhramotthānaśramo vyapadeśobhavat । urukampa eva gatiṁ rurodha । nūpuraravākṛṣṭahaṁsamaṇḍa-lamapayaśo lebhe । niśvāsapravṛttir evāṁśukaṁ calaṁ cakāra । cāmarānilo mimittatāṁ yayau । antaḥpraviṣṭacandrāpīḍa-sparśalobhenaiva nipapāta hṛdaye hastaḥ । sa eva karaḥ stanāvara:avyājo babhūva । ānanda evāśrujalamapātayat calitakarṇāvataṁśakusumarajovyājamāsīt । lajjaiva vaktuṁ na dadau । mukhakamalaparimalagatālivṛndaṁ dvāramagāt । madanaśaraprathamavedanaiva sītkārmakarot । kusumaprakara-ketakīkaṇṭakakṣatiḥ sādhāraṇatāmavāpa । vepathureva karatalama-kampayat । nivedanodyatapratihārīnivāraṇaṁ kapaṭamabhūt । tadā ca kādambarīṁ viśato manmathasyāpi manmatha ivā-bhūddvitīyaḥ tayā saha yo viveśa candrāpīḍahṛdayam ॥

"When the prince saw the beauty of the moon-like face of Kādambarī, his heart began to throb violently with pleasure like the nectar of the ocean (when in the whirl the moo.ı and Lakṣmī see each other). And he thought within his own self - "Why did the creator not convert all my other limbs into eyes ? Or what noble action was performed by my eye (in an earlier birth) that it has found the oportunity of seeing her uninterruptedly ? : Ah ! what a wonder that the

creator has made her an abode of all lovely objects! Where did he find the atoms for making this exquisite beauty? Certainly all these fragrant lusters, clotuses and water-lilies, that are in the world, originated from the drops of tears from her two eyes on account of the fatigue caused by the touch of the hands of the creator while making her". —While he was thus thinking his eye fell on her two eyes. Then even her eyes, that were smiling with astonishment caused at the sight of excessive beauty, remained motionless gazing at him. But Candrāpīḍa, shining under the rays of her eyes, bewildered at the sight of Kādambarī, was at that instant looking like a mountain. After she saw him, her hairs got erect; then there ensued the sound of her ornaments and then there stood Kādambarī. Then the god with flower arrow (i.e. god of love) himself caused sweat (on her body)—exertion caused by sudden rising was the pretension. Trembling of the thighs prevented her movement, but the swarm of bees attracted at the tinkling of her anklets were held guilty for this. Her garment was set into motion due to heavy breathing, but the wind of the deer's tail passed for the cause. Her hand fell on her heart on account of desire for touching Candrāpīḍa, who had entered within it, but that very hand became the object with which she covered her breasts. Pleasure caused tears to drop from her eyes, but the pollens of flowers of the ear-ring passed for its cause. Bashfulness prevented her from speaking, but the swarm of bees that had arrived on account of fragrance of the lotus of the face was taken to be the instrument. The pain caused by the wound of the first arrow of love-god caused sigh, but pricking of the thorn of the *ketakī* in the heaps of its flowers passed for the cause. Tremor caused shaking of the palm of the hand, under the pretext of the stopping the messenger, who was ready to deliver a message. And when the god of love entered into Kādambarī, there was born a second Cupid, and with her he entered into the heart of Candrāpīḍa"[1].

Very characteristic of Bāṇa's (as in Subandhu's) style are the dialogues inserted in the middle of a descrip-

1. Ed. Peterson, p. 189f., Ed. NSP. p. 344 ff.

tion or a narrative in quite small sentences for the purpose of giving lively expression to some sentiment. So Kādambarī sends the following love-message to her lover :

kiṁ vā sandiśāmi : atipriyosīti paunaruktyam । *tavāhaṁ priyātmeti jaḍapraśnaḥ* । *tvayi garīyānanurāga iti ve'yālāpaḥ* । *tvayā vinā na jīvāmītyanubhavavirodhaḥ* । *paribhavati māmananga ityātmadoṣopalambhaḥ* । *manobhavenāhaṁ bhavate dattetyupasarpaṇopāyaḥ* । *balāddhṛteti bandhakīdhārṣṭyam* । *avaśyamāgantavyamiti saubhāgyagarvaḥ* । *svayamāgacchamīti strīcāpalam* । *ananyānuraktoyaṁ parijana iti svabhaktinivedanalāghavam* । *pratyākhyānaśaṅkayā na sandiśāmītyaprabuddhabodhanam* । *anapekṣitānujīvitaduḥkhadāruṇā syāmītyatipraṇayitā* । *jñāsyasi maraṇena prītimityasambhāvyam* ॥

"What message can I send to you ? 'You are very dear to me'—will be tautological. 'I am yours'—will be a silly proposition. 'I have deep affection for you'—will be the talk of a prostitute. 'Without you I cannot live'—will be a contradiction to actuality. 'I am overtaken by Cupid'—this will be impertinent. 'I have been forcibly abducted'—this will be impudence of a captive girl. 'You must come'—this will be expressive of pride on account of good luck. 'I come of my own accord'—this will be fickleness of a woman. 'This slave is not devoted to anybody else'—this will be my meanness to report my own devotion. 'I do not send message for fear of refusal'—this will be bringing to sense a senseless person.—'I shall suffer terrible pains in case I lead an undesired life'—this will be excessive familiarity. 'You will come to know of my love through (my) death'—this will be an impossibility"[1].

Though not to the extent as the Harṣacarita, the "Kādambarī" too is of much value through many-fold allusions to the manner and customs of the time, in particular to religious life in the Śaiva circles.

1. Here (ed. NSP. p. 414) comes to end the story composed of Bāṇa himself. It is followed by the second part (Uttarabhāga) with its introductory verses, in which the son of Bāṇa states that he wants to complete the work of his father, not on account of his pride for composing poetry, but because the incomplete work of his father will be painful to the noble.

Thus for example all rites and sacred ceremonies that childless Vilāsavatī performs and gets at last a son, are narrated in detail. She sleeps fasting and wearing white dress in the temple of Durgā on a bed of reeds covered with grass; she bathes in the cow-shed, offers rich presents to Brāhmaṇas on every fourteenth day of the dark-half of the month she performs religious baths, visits the temple of the Mother, worships holy trees, etc. In another place the Śaiva ascetics are described in a very lucid manner: with fore-heads marked with white ashes and rosary in hands, in red garments and hold, a staff; they have matted hairs or according to their vow; they wear either the animal hyde or the bark of a tree[1]. A very interesting passage is the one in which the poet avails of the opportunity to firmly decry the custom of burning of widows[2].

Elsewhere we have already spoken about the Jaina novels that were written on the model of "Kādambarī[3]".

Indian and Greek Novels

Apart from the question of relationship existing between Indian and Greek Fables in verses, treated above, we should discuss here the problem as to whether or not the Indian and Greek fictions have influenced each other. Relatively fiction appears in Greek literature in a later period, but in all events earlier than the times when Daṇḍin, Subandhu and Bāṇa wrote their fictions. Hence the presumption that Indian novels originated under the Greek influence. Peterson[4]

1. Ed. Peterson, pp. 64, 208,
2. Ed. Peterson, p. 173 f. Cf. Winternitz, Die Frau in den indischen Religionen (Archiv für Frauenkunde 1917, Sond. 1920) p. 64 f.
3. Above II, p. 336; transl. 534.
4. Kādambarī, Introduction p. 98 ff, Weber, Ind. Stud. 81, 456 agrees with Peterson. So also Horovitz, Spuren griechischer Mimen im Orient, Berlin 1905, p. 96 and with him H. Reich, DLZ 1915, 553 ff. derive Indian fiction from Greek. Reich (ibid 594 ff.) will like to prove that the story No. 834 of the "Thousand and One Nights" is a Greek story in an "Arabic garb"; but all the parallels referred to by him—dream-life, ship-wreck, frequent Change of fortune, accurate descriptions of love at first sight, heroines of wonderful beauty—hold good even for Indian fiction; and in case Reich is correct in respect of the Arabic novels, his opinion will be so also for the Indian novels. H. Lucas (in the Philologus, N. F. 20, 1907, p. 29 ff.) "in der Verteidigung der Originalität des griechischen Volksgeistes und der Abwehr unberechtiger Ansprüche der Indologie" has shown his over-enthusiasm on little pertinent

had first of all given expression to this hypothesis and on its basis he believed to have discovered in the "Love-story of Kleitophon and Leukippe" of Achilles Tatius all sorts of echoes of and parallels to th: Indian fiction. But the single really striking parallel is a lengthy explanation on the life and marriage of plants[1]. In case here is an actual continuity of marriage of trees with creepers, that is more often mentioed by Indian poets, we shall be obliged to accept with L a c ô t e[2] that this idea in India is original and that it has been borrowed by Greek writers and developed by them. L a c ô t e points also to other characteristics that are found in Greek fictions and go back to well-known Indian presentations. So in the "Ethopian Stories" of Heliodor is mentioned a mysterious herb, that like the Indian plant Vraṇasaṁrohaṇī cures a wound in three days, and at another place in the same novel it is said that gods are to be recognised by the staring eyes and by the feet not resting on the earth[3], a current Indian representation.

E. R o h d e[4] has already pointed out that the motif of love in d eam and following it the selection of husband by

arguments. F. L a c ô t e, Essai sur Guṇāḍhya (1908), p. 284 f., refutes the hypothesis that Indian novles, especially the Bṛhatkathā, originated under the Greek influence; but he repeats the same hypothesis in 1911 (in Mélanges Lévi 250 note 2) and (p. 272ff.) and supports the contrary view. On the relationship between Indian and Greek fictions, see G. N. B a n a r j e e Hellenism in Ancient India, p. 218 ff. He comes to the conclusion that the difference is far greater than agreement and that we are not in a position to assume the dependence of the one on the other. See also K e i t h, JRAS, 1915, 784 ff. (against L a c ô t e).

1. Here it is said that in the opinion of philosophers, a plant loves another. In particular there are male and female palm-trees. "The male loves the female", and when they are widely separated, the former withers. A farmer goes to a raised up place and notes there a tree bending itself. As soon as he knows it, he is cured of his illness : he takes a branch from the female palm-tree, grafts it into the heart of the male one and thereby they rejoice. The decaying stem comes to life again and enjoys the company of his beloved" Liebesgeschichte des Klitophon und de Leucippe, aus dem Griechischen des Achilles Tatius übersetzt, Lemgo 1772, (towards the end of the book I). That is however, different from the marriage of the mango-tree and the jasmine-creeper, for example in act IV of Kālidāsa's "Śakuntalā" or of the small mango with the Mādhavī creeper in the "Kādambarī" (p. 567 NSP Ed.).

2. Mêlanges Lévi, p. 302 ff.

3. But even in the artistic representation one concentrated on the sovereignty of the swinging stride of the supernatural being : see K. S i t t l. in the Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft VI, 812.

4. Der Griechische Roman, 2. Aufl., Leipzig 1900, p. 47 ff.

self, through which the lovers are united first of all in a dream, has been repeated in the story of Zariadres und Odatis too, that Athenaeus (XIII, 35) narrates according to the report of Chares of Mytilene, a courtier of Alexander the Great as in Subandhu's Vāsavadattā. In Firdūsī's Shāhnāmeh, the daughter of the king of Rūm, Katūyūn, meets her lover Gustav, first of all in a dream, and then she selects him as her husband. It is apparantly sufficient to prove that the stories are associated together and that Subandhu has borrowed his motif from a very old story, that was taken to Persia already earlier, where it was heard by the Greek[1]. It is much less probable that here one should assume the influence of the Indian novel through Greek, especially when even the Greek narrate the story as oriental, glittering on the Persian soil[2].

But characteristics of this type can only prove that a number of Indian tendencies found way into Greek novels, but this cannot prove that the whole Greek family was borrowed from India. The characteristic form of the Indian novel is the insertion of stories in a frame story. Lacôte[3] now points to the fiction "Die Wunder Jenseits Thule" of Antonius Diogenes, where the entire story of the hero is told in the first person in the form of his biography. But the essence of an Indian narrative work is that its frame is an independent story in which other stories are inserted in an ornate manner. But when a person narrates his own experiences, it is obvious that probably a Greek writer could have planned it in the same way as an Indian. Besides the fact that in Indian as well as Greek fictions travel-adventures and love-stories are interlaced in one-another can hardly be the ground for making the hypothesis of their mutual dependence probable. It is remarkable that in the wonderful adventures in the whole

1. The self-selection of husband (*svayaṁvara*) is prevalent also among other nations (see Rohde ibid, p. 52 note 3), but it is above all usual in Indian poetry.

2. Certainly it is going too far, when Weber (Ind. Stud. 18, 458) writes: The story of Vāsavadattā is in substance already found in Athenaeus. The destruction by one another of the two parties of thiefs in Subandhu's novel reminds Weber of the Greek novel and of the animation of the statue though the embracing in the Pygmalion.

3. Ibid 283 ff.

of the fiction of Antonius Diogenes[1], we do not find a single parallel to Indian stories. It is most improbable that the Greek could have ever known that work of the type of the "Vāsavadattā" or of the "Kādambarī" or that they were able to understand it. The Indian fiction is so ornate a composition, a work of court poetry, suiting so much the Indian taste and its origin from the popular Indian literature with the use of particular style of ornate prose is so fully clear, that the hypothesis about its origin on some Greek model does not at all come into consideration[2]. It can in no case be proved that any Greek fiction whatsoever had come into India or an Indian fiction had reached Greece. Only this much is probable that some individual stories, tales, swāngs, witty anecdotes and above all individual motives had been taken from one country to another. Even in that case this occurrence took place rather through oral transmission than through any literary influence.

The Campūs

The campūs form a particular type of kāvya. They are poetical compositions, in which verses in ornate metres and ornate prose are mixed up together without letting either metrical or the prosaic form prevail. Since even in prose fictions we find interspersed verses, and especially when even narrative works like the Pañcatantra etc. contain a large number of stanzas, they too can be designated prose works, in which verses are brought in always with some particular objective : they are either epigrams or brief synopsis of a story, or they serve to bring an important moment of a story into prominence. On the other hand the campū is a particular type of literature, in which verses do not serve any purpose other than what is served by prose. Hence they

1. Cf. the Table of Contents in Rohde, ibid p. 277 ff. In the "Babylonian Stories" of Jamblichus (Rohde, ibid, p. 393 ff.) too no Indian tendency is found in the enormous number of adventures.

2. Cf. also L. H. Gray, Vāsavadattā. Introd. p. 35 ff.

3. Cf. Colebrooke, Misc. Essays II, 135 f.; Krishnamacharya, p. 146 ff.; Eggeling, Ind. Off. Cat. p. 1537 ff. The word *campū* is not explained,

can neither be called epic nor prose fictions. The Buddhist Jātakamālā[1] proves that the campū is quite an old type of ornate poetry. But even Hariṣeṇa's panegyric (praśasti) on King Samudragupta, contained in an inscription of about 345 A. D., can be referred to as an old example of campū.[2] Nevertheless the campūs, that we possess, are mostly recent works of little poetical value.

Probably the most famous work of this type is the Nalacampū or the Damayantī kathā[3] of the poet Trivikramabhaṭṭa, from whom we have an inscription dated 915 A.D.[4]. Here the Nala-story has has once more been narrated in an ornate style. The two great epics have been reproduced in the campūs. There is one Rāmāyaṇa campū (or Campūrāmāyaṇa[5]) of king Bhoja and Lakṣmaṇabhaṭṭa and one Bharatacampū[6] (in 12 *stabakas*) of the poet Ananta. In the 16th century (under Akbar the Great) a poet Kṛṣṇa or Śeṣa Śrīkṛṣṇa wrote one Pārijātaharaṇacampū and one Mandāramarandacampū[7]. A "swift poetry" is also the Svāhāsudhākaracampū, written in the 16th century, in which the poet Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa tells the love-story of the

1. See above II, 212 ff.; transl. 273.

2. See above, p. 41 and Bühler, Die indischen Inschriften und das Alter der indischen Kunstpoesie, p. 31 ff. According to Gawroński, The Digvijaya of Raghu and connected problems, p. 15 ff., this inscription had served as a model for Kālidāsa's Raghuvaṁśa. In Festschrift Windisch, p. 170 ff. Gawroński has tried to determine its date.

3. Edited with commentary in Bombay NSP 1885.

4. He is the son of Nemāditya of the Śāṇḍilya gotra. Cf. D. R. Bhandarkar, Ep. Ind. 9, p. 28. There lived one later Trivikrama, who was also of the same Śāṇḍilyagotra, who was a forefather of the astronomer Bhāskara; see Kielhorn, Ep. Ind. 1, 340.

5. Edited with commentary in Bombay NSP 1907. Cf. Peterson, 3 Reports 361 f.; Burnell, Tanjore, p. 161.

6. Printed in Madras and popular in South India, see Burnell, Tanjore p. 160.

7. Edited in Km. 14, 1889 and 52, 1895.

Moon with Svāhā, the wife of Agni[1]. Further in the 18th century in the Śaṅkaracetovilāsacampū of a poet Śaṅkara, the deeds of king Cetasiṁha have been described[2].

1. Edited in Km., Part IV, pp. 52-58. Pischel, HL., p. 29, compares Homer's description of the love of Ares and Aphrodite (Od. p. 266 ff.). The same Nārāyaṇa is also the author of Nārāyaṇīya, see above p. 140. On "Quick Poetry" i.e. the poetry in which events take place very quickly, is written in a harriedly short time. See Pischel, HL. p. 26 f. Many poeticians say that they have composed their manuals "as best" as "quick poetry".

2. According to Aufrecht, Bodl. Cat. 121 f. the poem may have been written in between 1771 and 1778 A. D. One Ānanda-vṛndāvana-campū of Karṇapūra has been edited in the Pandit, Vols. 9 and 10 and N. S. Vols. 1-3, One Śrīnivāsa campū of Veṅkaṭeśa (with a commentary) has been edited in the Km. 33, 1893. On the Jaina campū Yaśastilaka of Somadeva and Jivandhara-campū of Hemacandra, see above II, 336 f., trans. p. 534.

INDEX OF NAMES*

Entries for foot-notes have been shown by superior figures with page numbers.

*1. The words have been arranged in Roman alphabetical order.
2. The diacritical marks have been ignored.
3. The present-day names of places and persons have been retained in the form generally used by authors.

B

C

D

E

I

J

K

L

M